

53
108 i 1
2

CHRISTIAN LIBERTY ASSERTED, And the Scripture-Doctrine OF THE *TRINITY* VINDICATED:

Against a Book written by
Dr. *WATERLAND*, *H*

And entituled,

*The Importance of the Doctrine of
the Holy Trinity asserted, &c.* *6*

By a Clergyman in the Country.

It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,
Acts. XXVI. Ver. 14.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. NOON, at the *White-Hart* in
Cheapside near Mercers Chapel. M.DCC.XXXIV.



A
C

A

wh
the
the
Com
Law

T
and
is fo
Dr.
by t
neve
christ



Christian LIBERTY ASSERTED,

And the SCRIPTURE-DOCTRINE of
the TRINITY Vindicated.

DR. Waterland has lately publish'd a Book entitled *The Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity asserted*; the Design and Purport of which Book, throughout, is to shew, that they who do not profess, or who oppose, his Notion of the Doctrine of the Trinity, ought to undergo the highest Church-Censures; to be deny'd *Christian Communion*; and to be farther punish'd as the Law shall think fit.

That the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, as reveal'd and declar'd in *Scripture*, is an important Doctrine, is so far from being deny'd by the Adversaries of Dr. W's Notion, that it is zealously contended for by them in Opposition to his Notion. And as there never was a more gross, irreligious, and Anti-christian Error promoted, instead of the real and

B Scripture-

Scripture-Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, than that Doctrine of *Tritheism* which *Dr. W.* hath many Years been asserting and vindicating ; so there never was an Heresy more thoroughly confuted from *Scripture*, *Reason*, and the unanimous Sense of the primitive Christian Church, than this Doctrine of his, which he abusively calls *the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, and wou'd insinuate to be the Doctrine of the Church, has been. So that, I own, it is perfectly amazing to me, what he can mean by writing such an extravagant ill-natur'd Book, void of all Moderation, Decency, and even Modesty.

It was reasonable to expect, that the Doctrine which he pretends to be so *important* and *fundamental*, as to deserve even a Popish Authority to establish it, shou'd be some where or other express'd in *Scripture* ; and that he shou'd be able to set it forth in *Scripture-Terms*, that so we might, before we subscrib'd to it, or else be *Anathematiz'd* and ruin'd for not subscribing to it, be satisfy'd that it is really a Doctrine of Christ declar'd in his *Gospel*. And cou'd he satisfy us of this, all the Terrors of his *Church-Censures* wou'd be useless and in vain ; because every serious and real Christian wou'd of himself, and without these Menaces, immediately come into it and embrace it.

But as it is observ'd in respect of the Doctrines of *Popery*, that the Teachers of them are always most zealous for applying the wholesome tho' sanguinary Laws of the Church, in Defense and Support of those Doctrines, which of all others are most absurd in themselves, and most contradictory to *Scripture* and *Reason* ; so *Dr. W.* is here playing the same Part. For tho' he has been call'd upon, over and over, to shew where his Doctrine is declar'd in *Scripture* ; and to produce either so much as one single Text thence, or one Testimony of any

any one Writer of the antient Church for it ; yet he has always fail'd, and must for ever fail of doing it. He has wrested Scripture (to make it speak his Sense) even to a shameful Degree, and yet he cannot make it speak it ; and he has misrepresented and perverted the Creeds and Testimonies of the Writers of the antient Church by every Art of Sophistry, unfair and unscholar-like Interpretation of their Words, in flat Contradiction to the plain and express Sense of them. And the effect has been, that the more he has been confuted in every respect, the more obstinate and angry he has been ; and when *Scripture*, *Reason*, and all *Antiquity* are shewn to be against him ; when it has been prov'd to a Degree of Demonstration, that his Notion has not the least Countenance from any of these, and that in Truth it is a meer Fiction, first brought into the Church, and begun to be promoted, towards the latter End of the fourth Century, thro' a wilful Corruption of the Doctrine of the † *Nicene* Council, and in plain Opposition to it, by such Men as *Gregory Nyffen*, *Maximus*, and a few other *Tritheists* ; and has been propagated, with other Superstitions in the Popish Church, by popish Violence and Persecution ; and has liv'd to be espous'd and refin'd by *Dr. W.* so as to appear, as will be shewn in these Papers, even shocking to a Christian ; when all this has been fully and evidently prov'd, now at last, in Defiance as it were of the common Sense of Mankind, he puts on an Air of assurance, calls his Hypothesis at Random *the Doctrine of the holy Trinity*, asserts boldly that it is important and fundamental, and to disgrace the Church with it, calls upon her to send out her Censures against all who deny or oppose it.

† See the *True Narrative of the Controversy concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, against Dr. Berriman*, P. 76—110. and *Dissert. Prav. ad Novat.* P. 59—70. edit. Jackson.

If some thro' Bigotry and Want of thinking, and others thro' Indifference in Matters of Religion and want of Honesty, were not dispos'd to disregard the great and plain Doctrines of Scripture, Dr. W's. Hypothesis had long since been universally exploded ; and there wou'd have been no Need of my taking Notice of a Book, the unreasonable and infamous Nature of which is more than a Confutation of it.

But as such a Book ought not to pass uncensur'd, I shall spend some Observations upon it.

It is, in the first Place, evident, by calling his Notion of the Trinity an *important* and *fundamental* Doctrine, that he does not at all understand what is a *fundamental* Doctrine of Religion.

As in *natural Religion* there is no *fundamental* Doctrine or Article, but which is clearly evident and demonstrable by *Reason* ; so in *reveal'd Religion* there is no *fundamental* Doctrine or Article, but which is clearly express'd in *Scripture* ; and which likewise by its own Nature, or the express Testimony of the *Scripture* itself, is declar'd to be necessary or fundamental. Therefore,

In *natural Religion* there is but *one* fundamental Article, which is fully express'd by the Apostle, [Heb. 11. v. 6.] *He that cometh to God (as a Worshipper of him) must believe that He is, and that He is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.*

The Belief of the Existence of God and his providential Government of the World, and worshipping Him under the Expectation of a Judgment to come, is the Sum and Substance of *natural Religion*.

In the Christian reveal'd Religion there are *two* fundamental Articles, thus declar'd by our Saviour Himself ; *This is Life eternal that they may know Thee (the Father) the ONLY TRUE GOD, and Jesus Christ*

Christ whom thou hast SENT, [John 17. v. 3.] St. Paul expresseth the same otherwise thus, [1 Cor. 8. 6.] *To us there is but ONE GOD, even the FATHER, of whom are all things.* And one Lord Jesus Christ, By (Through) whom are all Things ; again, [1 Tim. 2. 5.] *There is ONE GOD, and ONE MEDiator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus :* And again, He sums up the whole of his preaching, and of the Christian Religion, in two Articles, namely, [Acts 20. v. 21.] *Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.*

In these two express fundamental Articles is included the whole both of natural Religion, and the Christian Revelation. In the *Mission* of Christ, and his being *Mediator*, is contain'd and included not only the Belief of his *Death, Resurrection* and *Ascension*, as being by God's Appointment prerequisite to his Office ; but also all the Power and Authority which God gave Him in Consequence of it. So that there was no need particularly to mention the *Mission* of the Holy Ghost and Belief in Him, because that was included in the Mediatorial Mission and Power of Christ, whom God, upon his Prayers to Him for that Purpose, [John 14. v. 16.] granted and authoriz'd to send the *Holy Spirit*, to be his *Minister* in the Affairs of the Church his Kingdom. On which Account our Saviour bid his Disciples *baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* (Mat. 28. v. 19.) And St. Paul (*Ephes.* 4. v. 4,5,6.) fully expresseth the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity in these Words ; viz. *One Spirit—One Lord—One God and Father of all, who is Above all.*

These plain Texts need no Interpretation, and are plainer in themselves than any Exposition can make them. Yet Dr. W's. Doctrine of the Trinity, which he calls *fundamental*, not only supposes that there are no such Texts in Scripture ; but that the

the direct contrary to them is the fundamental Doctrine of the Trinity. According to his Notion, our Saviour shou'd have said ; *This is Life eternal* (not to know *Thee the Father the only true God*, but) to know the only true God, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost* ; and *Jesus Christ, the same only true God, whom thou hast SENT.* And St. Paul, instead of saying, *to us (Christians) there is but one God, even the FATHER, Of whom are all Things*—and one *Lord Jesus Christ, By (through) whom are all things,* shou'd have said ; *to us Christians there is but one God [not the Father, but] the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Of whom are all Things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, the same God, By (through) whom are all Things.* St. Paul distinguisheth where he shou'd not (according to Dr. W.) in calling the *Father* the *one God* of the Christians, in express Contradistinction to the *Son &c* ; whereas Dr. W. thinks and asserts, that the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* are as much *the one God of Christians*, as the *Father* (alone by St. Paul declar'd to be so) is. Again, instead of saying, *there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men &c.* he shou'd have said (in direct Contradiction) *there is one God who is Mediator between God and Men* : for that the *Son* (who was made Flesh) the *Man Christ Jesus, whom St. Paul stiles Mediator*, is equally, Dr. W. thinks, *Supreme God* with the *one God and Father of all, to whom he is Mediator.* Once more, instead of saying, *one Spirit—one Lord—one God and Father of all, who is above all*, the Apostle ought, according to Dr. W., to have included the *one Spirit* and the *one Lord* in the *one God*, and not to have distinguish'd the *one God* from them by the personal Appellation of *Father of all, who is above all* ; as if he was eminently and peculiarly the *one God* more than, or above, the *Son and Spirit.*

Dr. W. cannot, I am sure, with Truth or Justice say, that I have in the least misrepresented his Nation of the Sense of the preceeding Texts of Scripture, who every where declares *the one God of Christians* (whom *St. Paul* stiles *the one God and Father of all, who is above all*, and whom Christ Himself stiles his *Father and God*, *John* 20. v. 17. *Heb.* 1. v. 9.) to be the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; whom he teaches and avows to be * *three distinct, equally Supreme, necessarily existent, and independent divine acting Substances, or intelligent Agents, absolutely equal in Nature and all Essential Perfections*: and esteems *Self-Origination*, which he allows to be now peculiar to the *Father*, to be no *essential* or divine Perfection at all, but a meer *Mode of Existence*, fortuitous and precarious; even so precarious and mutable, that the *Son* might have been *Self-originated* and the † *Father*, and the *Father* might have been *begotten* and the *Son*, had it been so agreed between them; and that also, by the same Agreement, the *Holy Ghost* might have been either the *Father* or the *Son*, or both by turns, as now He is neither; and so the whole *Œconomy and Order of the Christian Religion* might have been inverted. If this is not supposing the Foundation both of natural and reveal'd Religion to be *mutable*, and possible to have been the Reverse of what it is, and that the Scripture Dispensation is a meer *Babel, and Abuse of Sense and Language*, I know not what can be call'd so.

Yet this is the Doctrine, so fundamentally opposite to Christianity, which *Dr. W.* presumes to call the *important and fundamental Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*; and this is the Doctrine, so justly and highly obnoxious to the Censures of the Church,

* See his second Defense, p. 367, &c.

† Ibid. p. 177.

and the whole Body of Christians, which he has the Assurance (as if it was the Churches Doctrine) to call upon the Church to authorize, and establish by Humane Authority.

The Church, which he means, has had the *true Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity* laid before it, in the *Propositions* relating to this Doctrine which the late *Dr. Clarke* deduc'd from Scripture. These were well consider'd by the most eminent and learned Body of the Clergy ; who after mature Deliberation, and without any Prejudice in Favour of *Dr. Clarke*, did not gainsay any Part of his Propositions ; or alledge, either that he had misunderstood or misinterpreted any one of above a thousand Texts of Scripture, on which his Propositions were founded ; or that any one of them was not rightly deduc'd from the Scriptures, which he brought to support them. What was this but a tacit Determination in Favour of the *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*, asserted by *Dr. Clarke*. But as no learned and eminent Man has yet appear'd in Defense of *Dr. W's.* Notion ; so it is to be hop'd, that none will ever be so unwise as to risque the Reputation of his Learning and Religion, by appearing in so indefensible and bad a Cause. One eminent Prelate * has already shewn his Sense of the *Dr's* fundamental Doctrine, by not so much as mentioning it in his Catalogue of the great and fundamental Doctrines of Christianity. So that as every Christian cannot but be surpriz'd at, so every Scholar must contemn, those high and arrogant Demands here made of their Faith to a Doctrine, which it is impossible that any knowing sincere Christian shou'd believe, or shou'd not utterly renounce and detest.

* See the Bishop of London's 2d Past. Let. p. 24, 25. &c.

I proceed to examine his Conduct towards, and Treatment of those, who, in Defense of *Scripture* and primitive Christianity, differ from his Notion of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

He says, (p. 38.) “ Can those who believe Christ “ to be God, and who honour Him as such, ever “ think it reasonable or pious to hold Commu-“ nion with Men, who, by what they call *inferior* . “ *Worship*, do thus manifestly dishonour and de-“ grade their God and Saviour, denying his di-“ vine Perfections &c.” To the same Purpose he adds, (p. 42.) “ Guilt is contracted by commu-“ nicating with those, who openly and resolutely “ corrupt the Faith (knowingly or ignorantly) in “ very important Articles.”

But how do they dishonour Christ, who honour Him with every high Title ascrib'd to him in *Scripture*? who refuse him not the Title of *God*, tho' to be sure not in *Dr. W's* Sense of his being *the one God of Christians*, whom *St. Paul* stiles *the one God and Father of all, who is above all*; this would be not to honour Christ, but to dishonour the Father who sent Him: but they acknowledge him to be God, as being the only-begotten Son of God, the *Word* or Revealer of his Will, whom God hath appointed to be their *Saviour, Mediator, and Judge*. And how do they degrade him by *inferior Worship*, who, as the Church exhorts every Priest at his Ordination, *continually pray to God the Father, by the Mediation of Jesus Christ*? Do they degrade Christ in their Worship, who, according to his own Command, *pray to the Father in his Name**? Is giving to Christ mediatorial Worship degrading Him; or is it degrading Him by *inferior Worship*, in offering (as he Himself has commanded us, *Mat. 6.9.*) all our Prayers primarily and ultimately to **God the Father**,

* *Jn. 15.16.—16. ch. 23.*

to whom He Himself also *prays*? Is it degrading Christ by inferior Worship, to say that *Prayer*, in the most proper Sense, is to be understood of *Prayer* directed immediately to the Father; — that one Part of divine *Worship* call'd *Prayer* is most properly and emphatically *Prayer*, when directed to the first Person of the Godhead; — that *Prayer* properly, or emphatically, speaking, is praying to the Father, to whom all *Prayer* primarily belongs*? If then all *Worship* of *Prayer* primarily belongs to the Father, is it degrading Christ by inferior *Worship*, to worship him (not primarily, but) in Subordination to the one God and Father of all, to whom he is *Mediator*, and through whom, therefore, all our *Prayers* and *Praises* ought primarily and ultimately to be offer'd to God the Father? This is our Rule of *Worship*; and if he is consistent, it will be his Rule too: Otherwise, let him say, not that we, but let him say, as he ought to say and in Consequence does say, that the Scripture dishonours Christ by giving inferior *Worship* to him; and that we, by following that instead of humane Inventions for our Guide, do likewise dishonour him by inferior *Worship*. I appeal now to any sober Christian for the *Charitableness, Equity, and Consistency* of Dr. W's preceding Insinuation.

The Texts of Scripture which he civilly applys to the Opposers of his Notion, as being such as openly reject the fundamental *Doctrines of Christianity*, and so not fit to be communicated with, are, viz. (Rom. 16.17.) † mark them which cause *Divisions* and *Offences*, contrary to the *Doctrine* which ye have learn'd, and avoid them. Again; ‡ (Gal. 1. 8.) *tho we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preach'd unto you, let him be accurs'd.* Again; || (1 Tim. 6. v. 3,5.) *If any Man*

* See his 2d *Defense*, p. 400.

† p. 105.

‡ p. 107.

|| p. 110.

teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome Words, even the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godliness—from such withdraw thyself. Again ; (Tit. 3. v. 10, 11.) * A Man that is an Heretic after the first and second Admonition reject ; knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemn'd of Himself. Again ; (2 Epist. Jo. 10.) † If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, (that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, v. 7.) receive him not into your House, neither bid him God speed. Thus we see how easy it is to abuse with Scripture-expressions. But is not making Scripture thus subservient, by gross and wilful Misapplication of it, to our Uncharitable Passions, really ridiculing and blaspheming it ?

He proceeds to insinuate (p. 131—188.) that the Opposers of his Hypothesis of the Trinity are either not sincere Men, or that however sincere they are in defending what in their Conscience, and after the best Enquiry they think to be *Truth*, they are nevertheless wicked and immoral, and impious Men, and ought to be treated as such. He alledges to this Purpose, (p. 189.) “ it is not meerly our Sincerity that can support us, for of that we know nothing, in any just or proper Sense, but by the Right and Reason of the Cause ; and we are not commanded to hold fast our Sincere Errors, (his reasoning requir'd him to say, our Sincerity) but to hold fast that which is Good.”

So then with Dr. W. Sincerity cannot be good, cannot be rely'd on, or so much as known, but by the Right and Reason of the Cause. This is very like laying Men under a Necessity of being infallible, or else to be damn'd for Heresy. But as I hope God will judge no Man by this Rule, so I shou'd be sorry that Men shou'd be so cruel to each

* p. 114.

† p. 126.

other as to do so ; and if Dr. W's Sincerity is finally to be try'd by his own Rule, by the *Right* and *Reason* of his Cause, I think, I may without Uncharitableness say, that he is, and will be found, a very *insincere* and wicked Man. Our Saviour supposes, that *Sincerity* is the surest Way to come to the Knowledge of his reveal'd Truth ; and has promis'd (*John 7. 17.*) that *if any one will do God's Will*, i. e. is sincerely dispos'd to know and obey it, *he shall know of his Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether he speake of himself.* Our Saviour therefore has taught, that *Sincerity* will secure Men from falling into dangerous and fatal Error. And as Men cannot but be conscious (if they will examine themselves) of their own *Sincerity*, as well as of their *Insincerity* (otherwise it is in vain that Religion is propos'd to them, which cannot be acceptable unless it is *sincere*) so their *Sincerity* will always be an Anchor of Hope and Confidence for them to depend upon *God's Acceptance* of their good Endeavours, to know and to do his Will ; tho' they may, thro' humane Infirmity, sometimes mistake it ; and have not (as not being infallible) always the *Right* and *Reason of the Cause.* It is therefore undoubtedly *God's Will* that Men shou'd hold fast their *Sincerity*, even tho' they are not free from *Errors* : and if Men, without Conviction, or for wordly Considerations, renounce those *Errors* which they *Sincerely* believe to be *Truth*, and so receive *Truth* into a dishonest and *insincere* Heart, I wou'd desire to know, whether they are more guilty in holding fast *sincere Errors*, or in holding fast *insincere Truth.* The *Doctor* seems to think, that if a Man does but profess what he calls *Orthodoxy*, howsoever blindly, implicitly, i. e. *insincerely*, he is a good Man : For as to his *Sincerity* he need not trouble himself about it, because he can know nothing of that but by the *Right* and *Reason of the Cause.* A

Man that runs down *Sincerity* at this rate, I cannot help thinking, gives just Suspicion of his own. And tho' the great Truths of Religion are very plain in themselves, and may easily be understood by the meanest Capacity ; yet as they who have any Knowledge of Mankind cannot but be sensible, how even these great and important Truths are darkned by Superstition, and even lost amongst Antichristian Corruptions and Errors, one cannot help pitying and judging favourably of those, who seem to be fatally blinded by Errors receiv'd from Education, and impos'd by humane Authority. Those who are thus incurably *blind* our Lord hath allow'd us to think to have no Sin (*John 9.41.*) on that Account ; but their Leaders and Teachers, who with the proud *Pharisees* pretend to see, as is there intimated, when they are really and wilfully blind, and not only so, but endeavour by the Force of Ecclesiastical Authority to impose their Blindness upon others, their *Sin* cannot but remain, as our Saviour says, and be aggravated with the highest Guilt.

He pretends (*p. 196.*) " the Question is not " whether there shall be Creeds or no, (for all Parties are for them under one Shape or other, and " always will be) but who shall have the drawing " of them, or who shall impose them— We pre- " tend not to impose Articles of Faith in an *arbitra-* " *ry* Manner, or to require any implicit Belief in " the Church : we require no Man to receive them " for *true* because they are ours, but because they " carry their Evidence along with them, and will " bear examining." In flat Contradiction to which Pretenses of his own he immediately adds ; " that " the Protestant Churches however do determine " beforehand, that every Person upon Examination " ought to find these Things true, which they have " form'd into *Creeds* and *Articles*, as to the main Things

“ Things at least, and where is the Harm ? ” The Harm is, that this is the very Pretense of the *Po-
pish* Church, their determining before hand that Men *ought* to believe (whether they can or no) whatever they have form’d into *Creeds* or *Articles*; and that Church’s Imposition of them is founded on the very Presumption which Dr. *W.* here adds, *viz.* (p. 197.) “ the presuming that there are some “ Things so *certain*, that the Reason of Mankind “ *ought* to submit to them ; and that *those* Things “ *which they have defin’d are of that Kind.*” As if the Definitions of the Church, founded on their Interpretation of Scripture, were so *certain* and evidently true in themselves, that a Man, upon examining them, can no more sincerely doubt of the Truth of them, than of the Truth of *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical Demonstrations*, to which he compares them. Nothing, I think, can be pleaded stronger for popish Ecclesiastical Tyranny, and Imposition upon Men’s Consciences in Matters of Faith, in Support of which, the *Excommunications* and barbarous *Persecutions* of that Hierarchy are executed. If the Definitions of the Church are to be presum’d as *certain* as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical Demonstration*, so that Men *ought* to find them *true*, and submit their Consciences to them ; I see not why the Dr. shou’d not speak out, and declare them *infallible* : For if they were *infallible*, they cou’d not be more *certain* than *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical Demonstration*, which is the highest Certainty. It is absurd, and more like Banter than Argument, to pretend that there is any Difference between this, which he calls the *Protestant Way*, and the *Popish Way* of imposing *Creeds* and *Articles*. The Papists say *their Church* is infallible, and therefore Men *ought* to receive the Definitions of it ; or to be punish’d with the highest Church Censures and Anathemas for not receiving them :

Dr.

Dr. W. declares, that the Protestant Way of imposing, supposes their *Creeds* and *Articles* to have such a Degree of moral Evidence to attest them, (p. 198.) that the Reason of Mankind ought to receive them ; that Men ought to find them as true and certain as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical Demonstration* ; and ought to be punish'd with *Excommunications*, *Deprivations*, and every other Way that the Church hath Power to punish them, if they do not submit their Consciences to them.

Not considering the Consequence of what he had said, he presently adds ; (p. 198.) " if indeed the Church Governours shou'd happen to administer *Poison* instead of *wholesome Food*," well what then ? he is so favourable as to say, " there will then be Reason for Complaint ; and if the Charge be made good against them, they ought to throw such Article out." But who shall make good this Charge ? who dare, or ought to judge against Church Governours ? He told us just before, that it is the Principle of the *Protestant* (as well as it is of the *Popish*) *Churches*, that every Person upon Examination ought to find these Things true, which they have form'd into *Creeds* and *Articles* ; because (he says) they are in the main as true and certain, (tho they have not the same Kind of Evidence) as *Mathematical* and *Arithmetical Demonstration* : and have such a Degree of moral Evidence to attest them, that the Reason of Mankind ought to receive them. This plainly precludes all Liberty of private Judgment and Conscience ; and it follows hence, that we ought not to judge against the Definitions of the Church, but ought to receive whatever is administered by it, whether *Poison* or *wholesom Food* ; or we ought to be depriv'd of Christian Communion, and to endure all the Consequences of the Church's Anathemas.

These

These, he says, (p. 199.) are the Powers which Christ has left with his Church.

He had civilly said (p. 198.) " our Way supposes Men ought to examine, in order to know that the Doctrine propos'd [by the Church] is true : and we judge with Reason, that if they examine with Care, and decide with Impartiality, they cannot think otherwise of it."

So then he will allow you to examine, provided you examine only in order to know that the Doctrine propos'd is true ; but you are not to examine, in order to know whether it be true or not : for if you examine and do not find it true, then it follows that you have not examin'd with Care and Impartiality ; and you must either examine again till you do find it true, or be punish'd with Church Censures, Excommunication, &c. as an *unsincere* and *immoral* Man ; for that you ought not to judge for yourself against the Definitions of the Church, but ought to examine till you find them true or receive them.

Now this seems to me a more deceitful and barbarous Pretense, to ensnare Men's Consciences, and then to ruin them for judging and acting according to them, than even the Church of *Rome* itself is guilty of. She more fairly and sincerely (however unjustly) tells her Members, that they have no Right to examine her Doctrines at all ; and therefore will not let them read the Scriptures, because as Dr. *W.* tells us, they ought to submit to all her Articles and Definitions, as being as *true* and *certain* as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical* Demonstration. She does indeed (as the Dr. wou'd p. 198.) allow a few, who are *capable* (by their *Superstition*, *Bigotry*, or something worse) to examine in order to know that her *Doctrine* is undoubtedly *true*, that they may have something to say against Opposers ; and may pretend, at least, that their *Doctrine*

ctrine will bear *Examination*: But as it is there at Mens utmost Peril, either with or without Examination, not to know the Church's Doctrine to be *infallibly true*; so Dr. W. thinks it ought to be here at Mens utmost Peril likewise, if, after they are encouraged to *examine*, they do not know the Church's Doctrine to be *certainly true*, as certainly so as *Mathematical* or *Arithmetical Demonstration*.

And this *Dominion over the Faith and Consciences of Christians*, they have (he thinks) a Right to claim, in opposition to St. Paul's plain and express Declaration in Respect of himself and other Preachers of the Gospel, that they *had not Dominion over Mens Faith*. (2 Cor. 1. 24.) This Text, he says (p. 200.) is of obscure Meaning; and pretends as if he knew not what to make of it. But had it been said that the *Church*, or *Church Governors*, *had Dominion over Mens Faith*, the Text with him would have been as clear as Light; and any one that shou'd have scrupled his Sense of it, wou'd have been charg'd by him as guilty of heretical Pravity. The Sense of the Text is plain enough. The Apostle told them, (v. 13.) that he wrote none other Things to them, than what they had read or acknowledg'd to be the *Doctrine of Jesus Christ the Son of God*, who was preach'd amongst them by him, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, (v. 19.) this was the *Faith* in which, he tells them, (v. 24.) they stood; and therefore in respect of their *Faith*, he says, he had no *Dominion* over them, either to alter or over-rule it; in this they had no *Lord* or *Master*, but Christ the *Author* and *Revealer* of their *Faith*, and *Ruler* of their *Conscience*: and He, and the other Preachers of the *Gospel*, who were the *Declarers* of this *Faith*, were the *Helpers* and *Promoters* of their *Joy* and *Consolation*, in receiving and standing firm in the *Faith* and *Doctrine* of Christ. Therefore (v. 23.) he calls God

to witness, that his *not coming to them*, as was expected, was merely out of Tenderness and *to spare them*, who stood in Need of Reproof on Account of some Divisions that were amongst them: *not that he had Dominion over their Faith*, or that, when he should come amongst them, he did expect that, upon his mere Authority, they ought to believe or receive any Thing as the Doctrine of Christ, or as an Article of their Faith, but what he had before, by the Inspiration and Power of the Holy Ghost, preach'd unto them, and which they were convinced, and had acknowledg'd, to be the Truth of Jesus Christ.

And if St. Paul renounc'd all Claim and Right by his mere Authority (tho an Apostle of Christ) to impose any Thing as Articles of Faith, or a Rule of Conscience, but what he had first prov'd, by the Power and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to be the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and the reveal'd Will of God by Christ; and had convinc'd those to whom he preach'd of the Truth of it; it cannot be Right, or become any Men, to claim such an Authority, who are not only uninspir'd and fallible, but often have, and always may have, worldly Views and Interests to serve by such a Power over the Faith and Consciences of Men. And the *Bereans* are commended (*Acts 17. v. 11.*) as being of *ingenuous*, free, and unprejudic'd Dispositions (which is the Import of the Word, render'd *noble*) in attending *with all Readiness* to the Word which *Paul* and *Silas* preach'd to them; and in believing it, after they had *search'd the Scriptures*, and found it confirm'd by them.

The *Church* then (any Authority of which in Matters of Faith and Conscience is never mention'd in the Scriptures, nor are we ever commanded there to receive the Doctrine of the Church) can only have an Authority to propose the *Doctrine*

ctrine of Christ, declar'd in the Scriptures as a Rule of Faith and Conscience to those who are convinc'd of the Truth of them ; and to instruct its Members in the great and important Points of Religion, which are contain'd in them. And as all ought to have the ingenuous, free, and unprejudic'd Dispositions of the *Bereans*, in attending with all Readiness to the Word preach'd to them, *which is able to make them wise unto Salvation* ; so they ought, with them, to have the Liberty of searching the Scriptures, in order to know and be convinc'd whether the Doctrine propos'd is true or not, before they receive or believe it ; and to assent to it or dissent from it accordingly with Impunity, and without Force or Compulsion of their Consciences by any pretended Human Authority over them. One might have hop'd, that the Protestant Principle of the sole Authority of Scripture as the Rule of Christian Faith, in Opposition to any Claim of humane Dominion over it, had been sufficiently understood and universally receiv'd, so as not to be capable of Dispute, amongst Protestants.

Confounded, as it were, with the Force of Truth he says (p. 200.) " the Protestant Churches claim no more than a " *directive or instructive Power* " over Mens Faith or Consciences." So far good ; but he adds, " *Church Censure and Discipline affect* " the overt Acts, the Speaking, Writing, Teaching, " perverse Things ; — for which (p. 201.) they " are accountable to the Church, as much as other " kind of Offenders are accountable to the State." The Church, he says, claims no farther Power over Mens Faith than what is *instructive* ; very well ; to be sure it has no farther Right or Power. But that we may not think ourselves the better for any Concession of his, he takes Care to let us know, that he means nothing like what he says ; for his meaning only is, that the Church claims not

to be a Searcher of Hearts, and not being so, it cannot know whether its Instructions and Doctrines are receiv'd and believ'd or not, and so long as Men keep their Thoughts private to themselves, they are out of the Reach of the *Church's Censure*. But if the Church knew Mens inward Thoughts, then he wou'd plead for a Right in her to censure and punish them, for not believing what it is impossible for them to believe; because, he says, Men ought not to judge against her Definitions, they *ought* to know her Doctrine to be true.

Was the Dr. sincere in saying the Church's Power is meerly *instructive*, he ought, in Consequence and Consistency with himself, to plead that the Church has no Right to go farther than merely to *instruct* her Members, by proposing to them what she judges to be the Christian Doctrine; and that instead of *instructing*, she *lords it over God's Heritage*, contrary to the Apostolic Ordinance (1 Pet. 5. 3.) when she requires any of her Members to make a declared Profession of her Doctrines, not expressly contain'd in the Scriptures; and demands the Submission of their Faith and Consciences to her fallible Definitions; and insists that they ought to receive them, and *examine them only, in order to know that they are true*; but not in any wise to doubt of them, or differ from them, under Pain of incurring her severest Censures upon every *overt Act* of speaking, writing, teaching otherwise, which cannot but be (according to Dr. W.) speaking, writing, teaching, perverse Things, howsoever true in themselves, or agreeable to Scripture, if they agree not with what she has *determin'd beforehand*, that every Person *ought to find true*. All Claim of this Kind of Authority to *impose*, and *censure* for not submitting to her Impositions, he ought to give up and plead against as inconsistent with the Office and

Trust

Trust committed to her, which, he owns, *is no more than a directive or instructive Power over Mens Faith and Consciences.* But to allow that the Church's Power is merely *instructive*, and with the same Breath to affirm, that she has Power to *censure* and punish every overt *Act of teaching, &c.* tho Men teach nothing but that which they are *persuaded may be concluded and prov'd by the Scripture* (which is the Promise requir'd of, and made by, every Priest at his Ordination) this is such an inconsistent and arbitrary Power of *instructing*, as is fit only for a Popish Advocate of a Popish Church to claim.

The Reason which the *Dr.* gives for the Claim of this *Dominion over Mens Faith*, is as truly a Popish Reason as can be given. He says (*p. 201.*) " can any Man claim a Right of *perverting* (so he " calls teaching out of the Scriptures) his Fellow- " Christians, as he pleases, and at the same Time " deny others a Right of doing what in them " lies, to preserve their People from falling into " the Snares laid for them? Shall they not be " permitted to make Use of those *spiritual Powers*, " which God has put into their Hands? There- " fore [*N. B.*] let the Adversaries be content to " keep their Thoughts to themselves, and then " no Body can have *Dominion over their Faith at all.*" No thanks to the Church then for that, according to the *Dr.* but to God only, who has not put it into the Church's Power to know Mens Hearts. But is not this *Popish Orthodoxy* in Perfection? The *Dr's* Complaint is, that if the Adversaries of his Notion claim a Right, as Christians and Teachers of God's Word, to declare what they believe and can prove to be the true Christian Doctrine; if they claim (as they are in Duty to the *Church*, as well as to Christ the *Head of it*, bound) to teach and instruct their Fellow-Christians in the Knowledge of God's reveal'd Truth;

and

and if, as they promis'd the *Church* at their *Ordination*, they are ready, with all faithful Diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange Doctrines contrary to God's Word; if they thus do their Duty to God and the Church, and are so happy as to convince many of their Christian Brethren by Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures; shall Dr. *W.* on the other Hand be deny'd a Right (instead of Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures, and in Opposition to these *spiritual Weapons*) to use his *carnal Weapons*; to do what in him lies, by calling out for *Excommunications*, *Deprivations* &c. not to *convince* but to *punish* all who do not agree to, or who dare to oppose, his Doctrine, how contrary soever it be to *Scripture* and *Reason*? Therefore I might justly return his Compliment, and ask him, "with what *Modesty*, *Decency*, or *Consistency*, does he claim a Right of *preventing* his Fellow-*Christians*, as he pleases," by such high and arrogant Pretenses of *Dominion* over their *Faith*, as if he was more than an *Apostle*; endeavouring by the Force of *Church Censures*, which he thinks he ought to have at command, and to throw out at pleasure, to *pervert* and frighten his Fellow-*Christians* from embracing the Truth of *Scripture*; and at the same Time deny others a Right, which is the common undoubted Right of all *Christians* equally, to *judge for themselves* (since no others are qualify'd to judge farther) in Matters of *Faith* and *Religion*; and also by *Christian Instruction*, with Reason and Argument out of the Scriptures, to do what in them lies to preserve their Christian Brethren from falling into dangerous Errors, or being infected with Antichristian Doctrine? what Presumption is it in him to call upon the *Church* to espouse his Errors, which his Adversaries have more Reason to call upon it to censure and condemn, as being most opposite to those *Scriptures*, which

which the Church has declar'd to be the Rule of reveal'd Truth? He did not learn of the Church his Method of preventing what he may think to be Error: At his *Ordination* he promis'd the Church, *to instruct out of the Scriptures the People committed to his Charge*; and to form his own *Faith* and *Doctrine* by that Rule; and he was then exhorted by the Church, *continually to pray to God the Father, By the Mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the Heavenly Assistance of the Holy Ghost.* This is a truly scriptural and primitive Exhortation and Form of Worship, of which the Dr. stands very much in Need of being reminded: and if he laid to Heart his Ordination-Promise and Duty, as a faithful Pastor, to instruct his Fellow-Christians in this Worship of God taught by the Church out of the Scriptures, and not to talk so foolishly, like a *Spanish Provincial*, of *Anathemas, Excommunications, Deprivations &c.* to propagate by mere human Authority, *Scholastic Absurdities and Contradictions instead of Scripture-Doctrine*, he wou'd appear both a more reasonable Man, and better Christian, than he now seems to be.

To give the Sum of this matter: if there is a Right at all of *private Judgment* in Matters of *Faith* and *Religion*, (and if there is not, Popery is the unavoidable Consequence) it follows necessarily, that there is a Right to declare this Judgment by *speaking, writing, &c*; otherwise it is a Right and no Right, which is a Contradiction. If any one thinks that what another teaches, as his Sense of Religion or Scripture, is erroneous, he has Liberty to refuse Assent to it, and so it can do him no Harm; if he assents to it, thinking it *Truth* when indeed it is *Error*, it can still do him no more Harm than he does himself in mistaking the Sense of Scripture in any other Point; i. e. it can do him no real Harm at all: God requiring us, in

Matters

Matters of Belief, not to be *infallible*, but only to be *Sincere* in our Enquiries after the Truth of what he has reveal'd to us. In fundamental Points sincere Men are in no Danger of erring, tho' *Churches* are ; have err'd, and do grossly err, and, what is worse, *impose* their Errors for divine Truths. 'Tis exactly the same in *civil* Matters. If I have a Right to judge for myself, in Relation to my civil *Property* and *Liberty*, I have a Right to speak and write in Defense of this *Property* and *Liberty*; and also a Right, in Conjunction with others, to oppose the Invaders of them. Therefore, as the Subjects of a State have a Right, by *Overt Acts*, to maintain their Civil Liberty and Property against all arbitrary and tyrannical Power, by uniting to reform it, or, if that cannot be done, to *destroy* it ; so the Members of the Church of Christ have a Right to maintain that private Judgment which they justly claim, independent of all Ecclesiastical Power, in Matters of *Faith* and *Religion*, by the *Overt Acts* of *preaching*, *writing*, and *teaching*, what they sincerely believe to be the *Doctrine* and *Truth* of God's reveal'd Will ; and to unite in Order to *reform*, or, if irreformable, to abolish and destroy all Ecclesiastical Authority, usurping Dominion over their *Faith* and *Consciences*.

This Assertion of Christian Liberty is the Ground of the Protestant Reformation ; as on the contrary, our Author's Notion is the Ground of Popish Superstition and Tyranny, and is immediately destructive of all true Religion.

Let a Man then do what lawfully he can, by *teaching* or *writing*, to propagate Truth, and preserve his Fellow-Christians from falling into unchristian Errors : but let no Man, or Body of Men, endeavour to force, by civil Penalties or Discouragements, or by any Thing which they may

may think to sanctify by the Name of *spiritual Power*, the Definitions of their fallible Judgment for a Rule of Faith. If they do, the Members of the Christian Church, who may in Judgment differ from them, have the same Right to inflict Censures upon them, and, when they have Power, to lay them under Civil Discouragements, *Deprivations*, or *Incapacities*, as any Church so call'd has, or can have, to inflict upon them.

The pretended Difference in the Case of one having *Truth* on their side, and the other being in *Error*, which this Author alledges (p. 203.) is all Fallacy, weak and absurd. For as both Sides with respect to themselves, are equally Judges of what is *Truth* and *Error*, both equally *right*, and equally *fallible*, the one can have no better Claim to impose their Definitions and Doctrines than the other: Nothing can be more evident. And nothing remains for this Author to say, but in plain Terms to tell us, what is covertly maintain'd all through his Book, that the Claims of *Papery* are a just Right over Mens *Faith* and *Conscience*, which Christ has given the Church; and that we ought to submit to them; that if the Church administers *Poison* instead of *wholesom Food* or *Doctrine*, we may be allow'd to complain, like those who by a tyrannical Power are forc'd to drink down a deadly Draught, but drink it we must and ought; because, he says (p. 196, 197.) *we ought not to judge against the Doctrine of the Church*.

His Allegations from Scripture, for the Claim of *Dominion over Mens Faith*, are all foreign to his Purpose. The *Heretics* whom the Apostles declar'd excommunicated from the Church of Christ, or order'd Christian Assemblies to reject from their Communion, were all such as deny'd or acted contrary to the express Doctrine of Christ in Points of the greatest Importance, and whom the Apostles

infallibly knew did so. They were such as either deny'd Christ's coming in the Flesh, the Resurrection of the Dead and a future Judgment; or such as allow'd of Fornication, and of honouring Idols by eating Things offer'd to them. And none were accounted Heretics with Respect to the Divinity of Christ, but the impure, prophane, and impious Gnostics, the Followers of Simon Magus; some of whom (the Cerinthians) deny'd Christ, the divine Word and Son of God, to be *passible*, or to have really suffer'd for the Sins of Mankind; ascribing his Sufferings to his mere *human Nature*, or to the Man Jesus, as this Author knows who do: others held three unoriginated necessarily-existent Persons*, in point-blank Opposition to the Unity of God, the one God and Father of all. This was an Heresy and Impiety both against natural and reveal'd Religion; this was a flat Denial of the only Lord God: yet this is the darling Notion which this Author espouses for Orthodoxy, with so much Wrath and Uncharitableness, as if he was possess'd with some of that old Heretic's Spirit, and was in the Gall of Bitterness, and Bond of Iniquity (Acts 8. 23.) But the Notion, which this Author perpetually stiles by the invidious Name of Arian, i. e. the Doctrine of the Subordination of the Son of God to the one God and Father of all, and who is his God, and Greater than He, is so far from being condemn'd as Heresy, that it is the very Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, inculcated in more than a Thousand Places of Scripture.

Let then every Church (tho' not infallible as the Apostles were) endeavour to follow their Example in rejecting those, only as Heretics, from her Favour or Communion, who either by Immorality of Life, or by wicked Error, contradict

* Τρεῖς αὐταρχοῦσαι & αὐτερνήτες. Const. Apost. lib. 6. c. 10. edit. Cor.

the plain express Doctrine of the Gospel ; this is St. Paul's Rule, *Rom. 16. 17.* Let the Definitions of Christ and his Apostles (not those of fallible Men) be the Rule to try every Doctrine whether it be (not of the Church, but) of God. Whatever Christian opposes, by teaching or otherwise, this Rule of Faith, opposeth not *Man* but *God* ; and in so doing is an Apostate, and cannot be sincere ; on which Account St. Paul says an Heretic is *self-condemn'd*, *Tit. 3. 11.* and so ought to be rejected from the Communion of Christians. And none are in so much Danger of being Heretics in a Scripture-sense, and incurring the *Anathemas* there denounc'd against them, as they are, who blindly following the Dictates of fallible or worldly Men as their Rule of Faith, do, as St. Paul did in his unconverted State, *kick against the Pricks*, deny the Faith of Christ, and by exciting Church Censures against it persecute, as he did, the true Professors of it.

How many have made shipwreck of their Faith by relying on this Foundation, I need not say ; but as it is certain, that the whole Scheme of this Author's Orthodoxy has no better Ground, he wou'd do well (if he is not incurably blind and infatuated) to consider whether, in his own Account of Heresy, he is not highly guilty of it, and ought to be rejected out of that Christian Communion, as a Teacher of false Doctrine, and a Deluder of his weak Brethren, out of which he is so zealous for ejecting others.

The Point plainly is, which he wou'd seem to debate in his Way (*p. 210—215.*) if the Scripture is a Rule of Faith in all Matters of God's reveal'd Will, and, as such, sufficiently plain in itself in all important fundamental Articles, and stands not in Need of an Interpreter, the Sense of whose Words, in necessary Points of Faith and

Religion, cannot be clearer and easier to be understood than those of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures themselves ; it hence undeniably follows, that the Christian Church cannot better consult the Honour of Christ, and of true Religion, and the Happiness and Peace of all its Members, than by proposing its *Creeds, Confessions, Articles of Faith, and Forms of Worship*, in the Words and Forms of Scripture. Hereby the Church can incur no Danger of Error on its own Part, and all the Members of it will be free in their Consciences, and cannot offend or deserve Censure, but by departing from the Faith deliver'd by Christ and his Apostles to the Saints, or Professors of Christianity.

Men may, indeed, and have, for worldly Ends, and to avoid Persecution from *Pagan Tyranny* and Superstition, perverted and deny'd this Faith, and have been justly rejected by the Church for so doing, as *Heretics* and *Apostates*. But still the Fathers of the Church, in the first and purest Ages of it, never ventur'd to enlarge their Creeds beyond the Bounds of Scripture ; or to express their Faith in Terms of *Philosophy* and human *Invention* ; being so wise, as well as pious, as to know, that they cou'd not better express the *Truth of God*, than in the Terms of his Word. And it may, I hope, be said agreeably to their Sentiments without Offense, that the Sense of the Articles of particular Churches, which are mere Interpretations of Scripture, hath been, and is, and, probably, always will be harder to understand, and be more liable to be disputed, than the Doctrines of Scripture form'd in Scripture-Terms, and relating to all important Points of the Christian Faith are, or are like to be.

A remarkable Instance of the Truth of what is said, is a Point which our Author seems to lay greater

greater Stress upon, than on the whole Scripture. The Council of *Nice* (on whose Definitions, Dr. *W.* pretends, what he calls Orthodoxy, and the Doctrine of the Trinity, is founded) express'd the Doctrine of the Scripture and the Church, concerning the Son's being the *only begotten of the Father, the Image of the invisible God, the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person*, this Similitude they express'd and defin'd by the Word (*ὁμογένειας*) *consubstantial*; which, literally taken, means more than a bare *Similitude* (tho' they meant no more by it) and may be understood, either of the *Father* and *Son* being of *one specific Substance*, in the *Tritheistic Sense*; or else of *one individual Substance*, in the *Sabellian Sense*. Now this was denoting, what was sufficiently clear in the Words of Scripture, by a *philosophical Term*, whose Sense was very liable to be disputed; and, accordingly, soon became matter of great Controversy and Contention in the Church. 'Tis true, the Council immediately explain'd what is meant by the Word *Consubstantial*, viz. that the *Son was not Consubstantial by Division of the Father's Substance* (as the Word literally imply'd) but that the *Word denoted, * that there was no Similitude betwixt the Son and those Creatures which were made by him; but that he was altogether like unto the Father only who begat him*. *Athanasius* + himself owns this was the Sense of the *Nicene Council*; and so does the Council of *Antioch*, || under *Jovian*, in like Manner understand it. This Sense of the Word was harmless in itself; and had this Explication, which, upon *Eusebius* of

* *Euseb. Cesar. Epist. apud Theod. His. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 12. & Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8.*

† *Oἱ ἀληθῖναι ομοιότηται οὐ [οὐδὲ] τὰ γεννήσαντα. De Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.*

|| *An. 363. Τὸ δύομα τὰ ὁμοοίας ἀσφαλῆς τελεύχηκε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ σαυτοῦ* [viz. *Nic.*] *ἐξυλειας, σπουδινόσης ὅτι ἐκ τῆς κότας ταῦτα πατέρες οὐδὲν εἰγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὁμοίος καὶ τοῖς τῷ πατέρι.*
apud Soc. lib. 3. c. 25. & Soz. lib. 6. c. 4.

Cæsarea's Proposal, was agreed to by the *Nicene Council*, always gone along with it, great and fatal Disputes might have been prevented. But the unscriptural Word *Consubstantial* being put into a **Confession of Faith**, and seemingly authoriz'd by a great and eminent Synod (tho never intended by it to be profess'd as the common Faith of Christians) they who were Lovers of Strife and Contention, more than Lovers of Truth and Charity, immediately fell a quarrelling about a *Metaphysical Term*, and laid a greater stress upon it, than upon all the Articles of the Christian Faith: one Party understanding it in the *Sabellian Sense* of being *one individual Substance*, and so, that the *Father and Son were the same Being, Person, Agent, or God*: The other Party, on the direct contrary, understanding it to mean the *same specific Substance*, in the Sense of *Tritheism* or *Ditheism*, which made the *Father and Son two distinct consubstantial Beings, Persons, Agents, or Gods*: both equally destroying the true *Divinity* of Christ, the Son of God, the one by confounding his *Person* with the *Father*, the other by *dividing the Substance of the one God into two Persons*.

Yet both these Parties, opposite as they were both to Truth, and to one another, had that good Opinion of themselves, as to stile themselves *Orthodox*; and both agreed (tho Heretics to each other) to brand, with the Name of Heresy, those who held the true catholic and primitive Faith, which was the Mean between the Heresies of *Sabellianism* and *Tritheism* held by these Parties. These, for Distinction's sake, I may call *Eusebians*, who, agreeably to *Scripture*, the unanimous Sense of the antient Church, as express'd in all their * *Creeds* and

* Vide *Symb. Baptism. apud Apost. Conf. lib. 7. c. 41. Iren. lib. 1. c. 2. lib. 3. c. 4. Tertul. de veland. Virgin. Prescript. adv. Heret.*

and Writings, and of the Nicene Council itself, declared their Faith in the *one only true God*, who was the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ ; that the Son was the most *perfect Likeness* of the Father, who begat or produc'd him by *his Will and Power*, before all Worlds ; that he was truly God, by the Exercise of a true divine Power and Dominion in the Creation of the World, and in the Government of the Church communicated to him from God the Father, and executed in *Subordination* and *Obedience* to *his sovereign Command, Will and Appointment*, who alone is the *Original* of all Power and Dominion, and alone the supreme God *over all and above all*, and greater than the Son, as he himself hath declar'd, *John 14. 28.*

This primitive Scripture-doctrine distinguish'd the Persons of the Father and the Son, in Opposition to *Sabellianism*, or those who held the *Substance* of the Son to be the *Substance* of the Father ; and also preserv'd the *Unity* of God, in the unoriginated Person of the *one God and Father of all*, in Opposition to *Tritheism*, or those who held the distinct Beings, Substances, or Persons, of the *Father and Son to be equal in Nature, Dominion and Power* : and this was the Doctrine which generally prevail'd, and had the Sanction of the most numerous and eminent + Councils of the Church, even in its corrupt State in the fourth Century.

But as the Leaven of Superstition and Popery encreas'd, and by Degrees prevail'd, the *Tritheistic*

Haret. c. 13, 14. & adv. Prax. c. 2. Symb. Lucian. Martyr. & Euseb. Cef. apud Socrat. Hist. lib. 1. c. 8. & Theodoret. lib 1. c. 12. Symb. etiam Nicen. & Cyr. Hierosol.

^t *Vide Dissert. Prav. ad Novat. edit. Jackson. p. 67—70. & Annot. ejusd. in Novat. p. 375—378. & p. 387—391. and the true Narrative in Answer to Berriman's Hist. Account of the Trinity, p. 92—110.*

Trinitarian Notion gain'd Ground, and establish'd it-self by Persecution and temporal Power : the *Man of Sin* grew up with it, and handed it down, from Age to Age, with many Superstitions, idolatrous, pestilient, and immoral Heresies, with which, as with Locusts, the whole Church was overspread, and the very Vitals of true Religion eaten up. And thus an Innovation, small in Appearance, and without any bad Meaning or Design at the first, once made in the Christian Faith, spread like a Canker, till every Part of the Christian Faith was corrupted by it: And Men having once departed from the Form of sound and Scripture-words, there was no End of their Wanderings, when, instead of Scripture, they follow'd fallible human Judgment (directed too often by Passion and worldly Interest) as their Guide.

The foregoing Observations, made to shew that the Scripture is the best and clearest Guide in all Articles of the Christian Faith, and easier to be understood, in all important and fundamental Points of Belief, than the best human Forms and Interpretations are, were necessary, on Account that the same Delusions and Errors, which prevail'd in the former Ages of the Church, by misunderstanding human Forms, and building false Doctrines on the pretended, but mistaken or corrupted, Sense of the Church, have seiz'd and been propagated in our Times.

To mention once more the precedent Instance of the Word [*οὐογότιος*] *Consubstantial*, or being of one Substance. From the Sound of the Word, one might be apt to think that the Council of *Nice* intended to teach, that the Son was, in a strict Metaphysical Sense, the *same specific unoriginated Substance* with God the Father, as if the Substance of God was divided into two Persons or Substances, or the Son was an undivided, but really distinct Part of the

Sub-

Substance of God the Father ; this is the literal Sense of the Word, but far enough from the Sense of the Council of *Nice*, as hath been shewn. Yet a Person unskill'd in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, or who never read or understood the History of that Council, will easily and naturally conclude that to be the Sense of the Council, and so be misled into the gross Error of thinking God the Father and the Son to be *two unoriginated Persons, Beings, or Gods*, because of the same Kind of Substance in both : it being impossible, as to conceive the Substance of the one God the Father to be other than *unoriginated*, so to conceive the Substance of the Son, if the same in Kind with the Substance of the Father, to be other than *unoriginated also* ; to suppose the *same Substance* in Kind originated and unoriginated being a most flagrant Contradiction ; and not less so than to suppose the *same individual, or undivided, Substance* to be *originated* and *unoriginated*. Indeed, as I have obser'd, if a Man has Learning enough to read and understand the History of the *Nicene Council*, he will find they meant nothing more by the Word *Consubstantial*, than to express their Sense, that the Son was not like to the *Creatures* which God made *by Him*, but was in all Things *like unto the Father* : or as *Alexander Bishop of Alexandria*, who occasion'd the meeting of the *Nicene Council*, declar'd his Sense, * *that the only-begotten Son was a middle Nature betwixt the unbegotten Father, and the Creatures which God made By Him*. The Council took Care to disclaim the literal Metaphysical Sense of the Word, which imply'd a *Division* of the Substance of God ; on which Account it had, about sixty Years before the Council of *Nice*, after mature Debate been rejected

* *Alex. Epist. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 4.*

and condemn'd by the Council of * *Antioch*, as a Word of ill meaning, and destroying the Unity of God. And for the like reason, after many Struggles *pro* and *con* about it for above thirty Years after the *Nicene Synod*, it was finally rejected, and struck out of the Creed, by a Council of above five hundred Bishops of the Eastern and Western Church, met together at *Ariminum* and *Seleucia*. The Sentence of the Synod was †; “ as to the Term *Substance*, which in Simplicity was us'd by the [Nicene] Fathers, but being not understood by the People gave Offence to them; and because also it is not to be found in Scripture, it is decreed, that it shall be wholly laid aside, and no mention be made of it for the future.— But we affirm, that the Son is *like unto* the Father, as the divine Scriptures expressly teach.” This is the Account of *Athanasius*; and *Jerom* agrees to it, and adds, || “ that the Bishops there did not regard the *Word*, so long as the Sense of it was preserv'd.” This Sense the Council declar'd to be, “ that the Son was **LIKE** unto the Father;” which indeed, as I have shewn, was the Sense of the *Nicene Council*.

As there never was a greater or wiser Council of learned and pious Bishops, assembled in the Christian Church, than this last mention'd, so their Example cannot but be highly worthy of Imitation, for the Preservation of Christian Peace and

* See the true Narrative against Dr. *Berriman's Hist. of the Trinity*, p. 39—44.

† Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα τῆς ςοίας ὅπερ ἀπλέσεται αὐτῷ οὐ πάλιν εἰδόθη, ἀγνοεύμενον δὲ τοῖς λαοῖς σκάνδαλον ἔφερε, διότε μηδεὶς γεγραπτὸς πειθάσκων, ἡρεσίς πειλαγεθεῖσας καὶ παντελῶς μηδεμίαν μηδίλια τῇ λοιπῇ γίνεσθαι.— OMOION δὲ λέγομεν, τῷ πατεὶ τὸ γὸν ὃς λέγεται εἰ θεῖα γεγραπτὸς καὶ μεμάσκων. *Athanas. de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc.*

|| Non erat curæ Episcopis de vocabulo, cum sensus esset in iusto, Hieron, adv. Lucifer.

Charity ; especially, since not only as bad, but a far worse Sense has been put upon the Word, and insisted upon by the modern Impugners of the primitive and Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, than was done at that Time, when the whole Eastern and Western Church, in Conjunction, agreed to lay it aside, and to obliterate the Memory of it for ever.

The plain and express Doctrine of Scripture, and the unanimous declar'd Sense of the primitive *Athenian* Church, had yet such an Awe over most of the *Athanasian* Party, that, in the Innovations which they had made in the Christian Faith, they durst not deny, but that the Father alone, as being *unoriginated*, was the *one supreme God over all* ; they durst not venture to affirm, that the *Son* (and much less that the *Spirit*) was [ο θεὸς παντοπάτωρ, ο θεὸς των ολών] the *one supreme God*, the *one God of the Universe and over all* ; or that he was *equal* to the *Father* in *Dominion* and *Authority*. *Athanasius* himself acknowledg'd, that, in the *Creation* of the World, the *Son* acted in Obedience to the *Will* and *Command* of God the *Father* ; and that he, the *Son*, being the *Sender* of the *Holy Ghost*, was * *Greater* than *He*.

But our modern Metaphysical Trinitarians, as if they were wiser than Christ and his Apostles, and the whole primitive Church, have advanc'd upon the Steps of the first Innovators, and improv'd the unscriptural Term *Consubstantial*, so as to build upon it, by vain Philosophy, the monstrous *Tritheistic* Notion of *three independent Supreme necessarily-existent intelligent Agents*, absolutely *equal*, and *coordinate* in *Nature* and all *Perfections* ; and when their *Tritheism* stares them in the Face, and

* He calls the Son πνεῦματος μεῖζον, because he sent him, &c. *Orat. 2. adv. Arian.*

frightens their *Sabellian* Brethren, who are ready on that Account to reject them, they, by Contradiction very usual with them, affirm them, in the same Breath, to be *one independent, Supreme, necessarily-existent, undivided, intelligent Agent*; and say, * *they are the same in Kind—and also the same in Number*; i. e. the *same, and not the same*: and also scruple not to affirm, that the Son is † “THE Substance of the Father,” in Contradiction to the *Nicene* Creed, and themselves at other Times affirming, that the Son is (not the Substance but) *of, or from,* the Substance of the Father, and is a distinct ‡ *acting Substance or Agent.* And if any Thing can farther shew a Disregard to (not to say a Contempt of) the whole Scripture-Doctrine, it is, that the peculiar Prerogative of the *Father*, as being alone *unbegotten* and underiv’d, always held *sacred* and *incommunicable* by the *Antenicene* and *Nicene* Church, is given up by Dr. W. “who has nothing to say (2d Defense p. 177.) “why the *Son* might not have been *Father*, but “that in *Fact* he is not—and that there was “no *Impossibility* in the *Nature* of the *Thing*, “but that the *Father Himself* might have acted “the *Ministerial Part.*” An amazing Expression to come out of the Mouth of a Christian, who has the Benefit both of *natural* and *revealed* Religion, to inform his Reason and Understanding better! I will endeavour to make him ashamed of the gross Impiety of his Notion, from two eminent Bishops, one *Nicene*, and one *Postnicene* (against whom I am sure he has no Exception) *Alexander of Alexandria*, and *Hilary of Poitiers*.

* Dr. Waterland’s 2d Def. p. 394.

† Dr. Waterland’s 1st Def. p. 379, 380.

‡ Dr. Waterland’s 2d Def. p. 175, 366.

* " We must reserve to the unbegotten *Father* " his peculiar Dignity (or Prerogative) as having " no Cause of his Existence ; and pay a proper " and suitable Honour to the *Son* also, as having " a Beginningless Generation from the Father :— " our Saviour Himself telling us, *my Father is Greater than I.*" Here the Father is expressly declar'd to be *Greater* than, or *Superior* to, the Son, as being unoriginated, and the *Cause* of the Existence of the Son.

Hilary in his Explanation of the famous *Syrmian* Council (An. 351.) says ; † " that the Son is *subject* to the Father, by the *Nativity* or *Generation* " of his Nature. That the Father is *Greater*, " because he is Father, and the Son is *Inferior*, " because he is Son—and that the Son is *subject* to the Father, as the *Original* of his Existence," which plainly shews his Opinion of the natural *Subjection* of the Son to the Father, in his highest or divine Capacity. Again, he has the following remarkable Words, ‡ " It is most " *impious* to profess the Son to be *unoriginate* ; for

* Οὐκέν τῷ μὲν αὐγεννήῳ πατεῖ ὄντειον αἴσιωμα φυλακήεον, μηδένα τῇ εἶναι αὐτῷ τὸν ἀλίον λέγοντας. Τῷ δὲ οῷ τὴν ἀρμόζοντα πυλὺν αἴπονεμάτεον, τὴν ἀναρχὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸν πατρὸς γέννησιν ἀναπθέντας.—ἀυτῷ φάσκοντος τῇ σωτῆρες, οἱ πατέρες μετ' αὐτῷ μὲν εἰσι. Epist. Alex. apud Theodoret. lib. I. c. 4.

† *Subiectum alterum alteri nativitate natura*. Patrem in eo *majorem esse*, quod Pater est, Filium in eo *Minorem esse*, quod Filius est.—Patri *subiectus est* (Filius) ut *Autori*. De *Synod.*

‡ *Filiū innascibilem confiteri impiissimum est* : jam enim non erit Deus *nnus*, quia Deum unum prædicari natura unius innascibilis Dei exigit—cum idcirco Deus *nnus* sit, cum Pater Deus sit ; & Filius Dei Deus sit : quia innascibilitas sola penes *unum* sit — resputit erga innascibilem filium prædicari fides sancta, ut per *unum innascibilem Deum unum* prædicet. Hil. ibid. And our learn'd Bishop Pearson well observes to this Purpose, " we must not so far endeavour to involve ourselves in the Darkness of this Mystery,

" as

" for if so, there will no longer be *one God*,
 " because the Doctrine of the *Unity of God* is
 " founded necessarily in the Nature of *one unori-*
 " *ginated God*.—There is therefore but *one God*,
 " seeing it is the *Father* who is (absolutely) *God*,
 " and the *Son* is *God of God*, because there is
 " but *one unoriginated Person*—The Holy Ca-
 " tholic Faith will not therefore allow the *Son*
 " to be taught to be *unoriginated*, that, by hold-
 " ing *one unoriginated Person*, it may thereby
 " teach *one God*." Nothing can be plainer than
 that *Hilary* thought it *impossible*, and that it was
most impious to confess, that the *Son* was, or might
 be, *unoriginated*, and the *Father*; this was to destroy
 the *Unity of God*, which was necessarily ground-
 ed in the *natural essential Self-Origination* of the
Father only; and this is the undoubted Catholic
 Doctrine of all Antiquity. But in Opposition to
 this Doctrine of the Ancient Church, profess'd
 also by the most eminent *Nicene* and *Postnicene*
 Writers, *Dr. W.*, by a fictitious œconomy of his
 own peculiar Invention, has presum'd to affirm,
 that it was *possible* in the Nature of Things, that
God the Father might have been the *Son*, and
 the *Son* might have been the *Father*. Accord-
 ing to this new and before unheard of Hypothe-

" as to deny that *Glory* which is clearly due unto the *Fa-*
 " *ther*; whose *Pre-eminence* undeniably consisteth in this,
 " that He is *God*, not of any other, but *of Himself*; and
 " that there is no other Person who is *God*, but is *God*
 " *Of Him*. It is no *Diminution* to the *Son*, to say that he is
 " *from another*, for his very *Name* imports as much; but it
 " were a *Diminution* to the *Father* to speak so of *Him*: And
 " there must be some *Pre-eminence*, where there is Place for
 " *Derogation*." *Expos. of the Creed.* p. 35. edit. 4th. Which
 is directly contrary to *Dr. W's* Doctrine, that the *Son* might
 have been the *Father*, and so not *of Him*; and the *Father*
Himself might have acted the *Ministerial Part*, and so not
 have had the *Pre-eminence* of being *God of Himself*.

sis, there is not only no *Essential* or real Distinction, in *Nature* and *natural Powers*, between the Persons of the Father and the Son ; but the *one God and Father of all, who is above all*, and the *God of the Son Himself*, might have been the *Son*, acted the *ministerial Part*, and in all Things have been Obedient and Subject to the *Will and Commands of the Son*, as his *Father and God*. This is telling the World, that the primary fundamental Article both of natural and reveal'd Religion, the *Unity of God*, has no Foundation ; and instead of the *one God of Nature and Scripture*, is setting up a worse than Heathen System of *three fictitious, and equally Supreme, Deities* ; who by Agreement amongst themselves go by different *Names*, without any real Difference or Subordination of *Nature, Power or Authority*, all being, in themselves, and in their Natures, equally self-existent, independent, or underiv'd. He has pretended to alledge *Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity*, for this impious Hypothesis, and he has been confuted, over and over, from every one of them ; from above a thousand plain and expres Texts of *Scripture* ; from the most self-evident and demonstrative Principles of *Reason* ; and from the unanimous Suffrage of all *Antiquity*. He never was able to produce so much as one single Text of *Scripture*, but what proves any thing else as much as his Notion ; nor so much as one single Testimony of *Antiquity*, for three Hundred Years and more, that gives the least Countenance to it ; nor cou'd he ever shew, that it was not contradictory (as evidently contradictory as *Transubstantiation* itself) to the most demonstrative Principles of *Reason* : So that, all Things consider'd, the whole of his Scheme cannot but appear a monstrous System of the worst Heresies mix'd and confounded.

confounded together, destructive of all Science and Religion, and necessarily ending in *Atheism*.

He may well be afraid of *Scripture-Creeds*, *Tests*, and *Confessions*, i. e. Forms of Faith drawn up in the Words of Scripture; and is so far consistent, as not to plead in their Favour (p. 210—215.) these being as opposite to his Notion as Light is to Darkness. What he wants is a *complete Authority* (p. 196.) to send out *Anathemas &c.* against his Opponents, and by human Power to lay waste the Christian Faith, and drive all true Believers out of the Church. But as the *Wrath of Man worketh not the Righteousness of God*; so I hope there is so much Light, and Knowledge, and Love too, of true Religion amongst us, that Antichristian Tyranny will never be suffer'd to invade Christian Liberty and Truth, which happily prevail amongst the Members of this Church; and must and will finally prevail, in the utter Destruction of all superstitious and wicked Error.

Hearken to the Charity and Moderation of this Author's *moral Orthodoxy*: “*Theft and Murder* (p. 219.) are Crimes of a different Magnitude, “ yet they are equally liable to capital Penalties “ As to *Heresies* of such a Kind, they may be “ greater Sins than either in God's Sight: but it “ is not SO Necessary for a State to take Cogni- “ zance of them, unless they break in upon civil “ Peace.” This is sufficient to shew how civil he would be to Heretics, if he had but the *competent Authority* which he speaks of. He wou'd not punish them *capitally*, because, tho he may think them to be worse than *Thieves* and *Murderers*, it is not SO necessary for a State to punish them as they do *Thieves* and *Murderers*. But as there is no End or Bounds in the Tyranny of Superstition, shou'd it be thought *expedient*, and for the *Good* of the Church, tho not absolutely *necessary*, I am afraid he

he wou'd encourage, if not help to the pious Work of cutting those off (with the civil Sword) who trouble him, in their bearing Testimony to the Doctrine of Scripture against his Notion. He plainly supposes and intimates it to be necessary for the State [imagining himself, one would think, to be in *Spain* or *Italy*] to take Cognizance of them, as Criminals of the worst Sort ; but, like a true *Inquisitor*, desires them not to hurt them, at least *not to shed Blood* ; because, it is not SO necessary in their Case, as in the Case of *Thieves* and *Murderers*. How far he wou'd have the State go with these *Confessors*, he does not say ; he is afraid of directly calling upon the secular Arm to punish them ; and softly says, " that a Christian Divine may desire, " that such Offenders may *rather live to repent* " than suffer *Death*, or any *civil Penalties*." (p. 218.) Yet, on the other Hand, he is as cautious of absolutely exempting them from the Cognizance of the Civil Power ; without some Degree of which, Church-censures would not be effectual enough to ruin them.

In his sixth Chapter he undertakes to shew the Judgment of the Primitive Churches, in relation to the Necessity of believing the Doctrine of the Trinity. To this Purpose he says (p. 223.) " The Doctrine of the Trinity, implicit or express, always made an Article of the antient Creeds." Who doubts it? But why *implicit* or *express*? Did not all the ancient Creeds expressly declare the Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity ; the Doctrine of God (in most of the Creeds, *the one God*) *the Father Almighty* [*ταύτης πάτερ*, Supreme over all] of his only [or only-begotten] Son *Jesus Christ our Lord*; and of the Holy Spirit, &c. This is the Doctrine of the Trinity which we hold ; not *imply'd*, but *expressly* set forth in the primitive baptismal Creeds. But what has this to do with Dr. W's. Trinity? Nothing

like that is express'd in any of them. Therefore the Word *implicit* is to make Room for Art, to bring in his Notion. He wou'd have it thought, that tho' his Doctrine of the Trinity is not *express'd*, yet that it is *imply'd* in the ancient Creeds. We are contented with what is *express'd* in the Creeds, as being the Forms and Expressions of *Scripture*; however, we will be so fair as to allow of his Notion, if it be really *imply'd* in them. How does he prove it to be *imply'd* then? Why thus (p. 225.)

" in the Creeds we profess to believe in God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost: this (adds he) is declaring the sacred three to be the one God—it carries in it a Confession of the three divine Persons being the *one true God of Christians*" (p. 225.) Q. E. D.

Notably prov'd of a School-Doctor. But let us hear how St. Paul understands the Words; he says, *one Spirit—one Lord—One God and Father of all, who is above all*. Here, not the *three* divine Persons, but *one* of the divine Persons, the *Father* only, is declar'd to be the *one true God of Christians*; as the same Apostle says in another Place: *to us (Christians) there is but one God, even the Father*. And farther, that Dr. W's. Doctrine of the Trinity is *imply'd* in the ancient Creeds we not only cannot see, but we certainly know that it is not; because it was the unanimous Sense of the ancient Church, who form'd and us'd these Creeds, that the *one true God of Christians* was that Person, whom the Scripture stiles, in Contradistinction to his *Son* and *Spirit*, the *one God and Father of all*. Accordingly, in almost all the Creeds (agreeably to the *Nicene*) the first Article was, I believe in *one God, the Father Almighty*: the Father only being always profess'd to be the *one God*, in Distinction to his *Son* and *Spirit*, never so call'd either in any antient Creed, or by any antient Catholic Writer whatsoever. So that if the Words

imply

imply the three divine Persons to be the *one God* in the Creeds, they *imply* them to be the *one God, the Father Almighty*. The Creeds therefore *expressly* and *implicitly*, plainly and undeniably, teach **no** other than the Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity; viz. *one Spirit—one Lord—one God and Father of all, who is above all* (*Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6.*) and the *one God of Christians*, is declar'd in these express Words of the same Apostle cited above, *to us* (*Christians*) *there is but one God, even the Father, of whom are all Things* (*1 Cor. 8. 6.*) and this is spoken in direct Contradistinction to Jesus Christ, whom the Apostle there stiles the *one Lord*, by (thro') *whom are all Things*. This is St. Paul's *Trinity and Unity*, and it is ours, whom the Dr. civilly calls *Heretics*: Let him make his own Doctrine out of it if he can, and we shall no longer disagree.

Having done with Proof by *Implication*, he mentions (p. 230.) an ancient Creed of Cyril of Jerusalem, which is *express* for the Divinity of God the Son; it stiles him "*true God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, by whom all Things were made.*" Whether this Creed of Cyril be older than the fourth Century, may be question'd; however there is good Reason to think, that the Words [Θεὸν ἀληθινόν] *true God*, were inserted out of the *Nicene Creed*; because they are not to be found in any Creed of the three first Centuries, tho in some of them Christ is stil'd God. Cyril was one of the most moderate of the Athanasians; and he expresses his Faith, and the first Article of all the antient Creeds, very clearly and fully, that *the one God of Christians was God the Father only*, in Contradistinction to the Son. His Words are, * "*We ought not only to believe in*

* Οὐ γὰρ μέν εἰς ἑτα Θεὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλακὲ καὶ παπέρι
εἶναι τὸ μονογενὲς, καὶ εἰς δὲ ὅμοιον Ἰησὸν Χειτῆν, μοῦνον.
καὶ πατεροχάρακα. Catechesis. 7.

“ the one God ; but we also piously confess him to
 “ be the Father of his only-begotten (Son) and
 “ our Lord Jesus Christ.” And he immediately ob-
 serves, that Christians differ from Jews in this, that
 the Jews acknowledge there is but one God, but do
 not, with Christians, confess him to be the Father of
 our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet Cyril held the Son to
 be true God, and consubstantial with the Father ; but
 did not infer from either, that he was the one God
 of Christians, the one supreme God, or equal to the
 Father. Being consubstantial (he knew) imply’d no
 such Thing, nor was so understood by the Council
 of Nice ; and that the Son might be true God, and
 yet there be, to us Christians, but one God, even the
 Father of whom are all Things, was plain to him for
 this Reason, beause the Son was not the one God, but
 the one Lord, by whom are all Things : being the
 one God, of whom are all Things, denoted the Su-
 premacy of the Father ; and being the one Lord,
 by whom are all Things, denoted the Subordination
 of the Son to him who alone was the one God and
 Father of all, who is above all. Thus his own Au-
 thor, an Athanafian too, is clear and strong
 against his Doctrine of the Trinity. And the
 Learned Dr. Spencer well explains the Text (1 Cor.
 8. 6.) to this purpose ; * “ Under the New Testa-
 ment, the Title of King and Lord is eminently
 ascribed to Christ, that instead of the Gods and
 Lords of the Gentiles, all might learn to wor-
 ship one God, the Father of all ; and one Lord,
 Jesus Christ.”

* Sub novo testamento nomen Regis & Domini Christi
 signanter tribuitur, ut omnes, Diis & Dominis Ethnicorum ad
 crucem aut potius inferos amandatis, unum Deum, Patrem om-
 nium, & unum Dominum, Jesum Christum, venerari diserent
 Ds Leg. Heb. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 253.

The Dr. next observes, that *Irenæus* in explaining the Rule of Truth says, * “ There is *one* “ *God Almighty*, who created all Things By his “ Word— adding, that he made all Things By his “ Word and Spirit.” This *one God Almighty*, *Irenæus*, in the Place, says, is the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Now what is this to Dr. *W*’s Purpose? He says, it “ *intimates* the real and proper Divinity of “ *the Son and Holy Ghost*.” But it does not *intimate*, but *express* the Supreme Divinity of the *one God*, *the Father Almighty*. And who deny the real and proper Divinity of the Son, but they who either make Him + *the Substance of the Father*, the *same individual God* with the Father; or another distinct, † *necessarily-existent*, *acting Substance*, and Supreme God? The true and proper Divinity of the Son subordinate to the Father, as declar’d in Scripture, and by the Suffrage of the primitive Church, is what we have been pleading for, and vindicating these twenty Years against Dr. *W*. and the modern Impugners of it. We believe, and constantly teach, that Christ is God, as being the *only-begotten Son of the one God, the Father Almighty*, profess’d in all the antient Creeds: and can any Thing be plainer than that, to shew that Christ, the *Word and Son of God*, is not the *one God Almighty*, mention’d in *Irenæus’s Rule of Faith*; it is there said, that the *one God Almighty created all Things by his Word, and by his Spirit*? Are not the *Word and Spirit* the *Ministring and subordinate Agents, the || Hands (or*

* *Iren. adv. Heres. lib. 1. c. 22. p. 98. edit. Massuet.*

† *Dr. Waterland’s first Def. p. 379, 380.*

‡ See his *2d Def. p. 175, 366.*

|| τὸς θεοῦ χεὶς [ὁ νιὸς] — ὑπεργόσα τῷ θελήματι τὸν θεοῦ καὶ παῖρός. *Iren. lib. 5. c. 5.* See a full Account of the Sense of the Antients in this Point, in *Annotat. ad Novat. p. 324, 325. Edit. Jackson.*

instrumental Agents) as he with others of the Ancients call them, by whom the one God, the Father Almighty, made and governs all Things? Here then is indeed the Doctrine of the Trinity fully express'd, but it is the Scripture-Trinity, and such as is directly opposite to Dr. W's Trinity. I pity his next Observation, as I suppose his Adherents will be ashamed of it: he was to shew, from the Antient Creeds, his Doctrine of the three divine Persons being *one God*; and having shewn nothing more, than that the Son is stiled or intimated to be God, but in express Distinction to *the one God*, *the Father Almighty*, and in *Subordination* to him; and not being able to shew, that the Holy Ghost is ever so much as barely stil'd *God*; therefore, lest in the Account he shou'd be oblig'd to drop the Divinity of the *Spirit*, he observes very acutely (p. 231.) “ * there is a Creed in *Tertullian* fully “ expressing the Divinity of God the Son, and “ [N. B.] obliquely intimating the Divinity of the “ Holy Ghost.” This is Demonstration indeed; the Creed obliquely intimates the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; what Need of any farther Proof? But this happens to be a most unlucky Observation for the Dr. because it undeniably shews, that *Tertullian* knew that the Holy Ghost was never stiled God in any ancient Creed. For his own Doctrine, that the *Spirit* was *God*, as being a *consubstantial Part of the Substance of the one God the Father*, was, he owns, a Doctrine, which he had just then learned † of the *Paraclete of the Montanists*; but he never pretends or intimates it to have

* *Adv. Prax. c. 2.*

† Nos enim—maxime *Paracleti* non hominum discipuli duos quidem definimus, Patrem & Filium, & IAM tres cum Spiritu Sancto, secundum rationem Oeconomiae [scil. unius substantiae] in tribus cohærentibus, *adv. Prax. c. 12.*] quæ facit numerum, *adv. Prax. c. 13.*

been the Doctrine of the catholic Church : nay he owns that the Catholics charg'd his new Doctrine with * *Tritheism*. Therefore *Tertullian*, tho', when a *Montanist*, he stil'd the Holy Spirit God, which no Ancient had done before him, yet he wou'd not so far innovate, as to assert it as a Part of the Christian Faith deliver'd in any Creed, but defend'd his Notion as a Part of his *Montanism*; so that nothing in Nature cou'd ever be more opposite to the Dr's. Purpose and Doctrine, than his own Observation in this Place.

In Truth, all the ancient Creeds are as full and express against Dr. W's. Doctrine of the Trinity, as if they had been made on purpose in Opposition to it: and of all Things, I thought he might have been so prudent at least, as not to have appeal'd to the Creeds of the ancient Church, than which, next to Scripture, we desire no stronger Proof against his Notion.

Having try'd what he can do with genuine Creeds, he next presents his Reader (p. 234.) with one which is *spurious*, the famous romantic Creed which † *Gregory of Neocæsarea* is said to have receiv'd by Revelation from the *Virgin Mary*, who sent it him by St. John. Had there really been any such Creed in the Time of *Gregory of Neocæsarea*, *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, in whose Time *Gregory* flourish'd, most probably wou'd have known it, and made mention of it. *Jerome*, at least, wou'd have taken Notice of it, had he known it to have been *Gregory's*. The Stile of it shews it not to be older than the fourth Century; and some Parts of it favour of being later than the Council of *Nice*,

† Simplices quique, quæ major semper credentium pars, ——
duos & tres JAM jaſtant a nobis prædicari, ſe vero unius Dei
cultores præſumunt. *ibid.* c. 3.

† See *Greg. Nyſſ. in laude Greg. Thaumat.* p. 378. *Nicephor. Hift. Eccles.* lib. 6, c. 17. *Ruffin. Eccles. Hift. Enſeb.* lib. 7. c. 25:
tho'

tho' the [Θμογόσιος] *Consubstantiality* is not mention'd in it. Even in this creed the Holy Ghost is not stil'd *God*; and the Son is represented as the Person (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) by whom (so the Words ought to be render'd) is manifested *God the Father, who is above all, and in all.* It contradicts the Council of Nice in one Point, by calling the *Son* [*αἰδίος αἰδίς*] *eternal of eternal*; the Council of Nice, on the contrary, anathematizing those, who affirm † that the *Son was not existent before he was begotten*; they believing him not to be an *eternal Son*, but the *eternal* [*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*] *Word or Reason existing in the Father, before he was begotten of or from him.* However, let the Dr. make the best of this Creed likewise; neither the *Consubstantiality* or *Coequality* of the *Son* and *Spirit* with the *Father* are *express'd*, or *imply'd*, in it, (tho' the contrary are) nor are the three divine Persons said, or intimated, to be *one God, the one God of Christians*; on the other Hand, the *Father only is stil'd God, who is above all, and in all.*

I shall, therefore, on the Head of Creeds, readily agree to what he says (p. 237) " that the Creeds " are to be interpreted according to the Mind " of the Church; and the Mind of the Church is " to be learned, chiefly, from the Writings of " the Fathers." We have already experienc'd his Proficiency, and Skill in explaining the Creeds; now let us see what he'll make of the Fathers. As just before he palm'd a forg'd Creed upon us, so now he brings a Parcel of false and insufficient Witnesses, for Evidence of the Sense of the ancient Church: And, instead of proving his Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the ancient *Antenicene Church,*

† Πείν γερρνθλωας ἐκ ἦν. *Anathem. Concil. Nic.* the Coun-
cil's Opinion was, as *Eusebius* tells us: Πείν ἐρεγγεία γερ-
θλωας, συράπτεις λω EN τῷ πατεῖ αγερρήλως. *Epist. Euseb. apud
Theodoret. Hist. lib. I. c. 12. & Socrat. lib. I. c. 8.*

from the primitive Catholic Writers of that Church, he gives us Scraps from *Postnicene* Writers, engag'd to support Innovations made in the Faith of the ancient Church ; such as *Athanasius*, *Gregory Nyssen*, *Hilary*, *Ruffinus*, *Fulgentius*, &c. This Procedure, therefore, is very unfair ; and his Evidence for the Doctrine of the ancient *Antenicene* Church deserves no more Credit, than that of *Arius* or *Eunomius* for the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Church. How incompetent his Witnesses are I shall give a Specimen in the famousest of them, *Athanasius*.

* *Arius* taught that the Son subsisted by the Will of the Father, as the Doctrine of the ancient Church ; *Athanasius* replies to the *Arians* very wisely, + let them tell us from whom of the primitive Saints they learn'd this Doctrine, that the Son subsisted by the Will of the Father. This shews how little *Athanasius* was acquainted with the Writings of the primitive Saints, or the Doctrine of the primitive Church ; in which there is not any Doctrine more expressly and unanimously taught than this, that the Son was begotten and subsisted † by the Will of the Father. The *Arians*, on the contrary, might very well have ask'd *Athanasius*, from what primitive Saint, or Writer, he had been taught his novel Doctrine of the Son's deriving his Subsistence, not from the Will, but from the || Nature of the Father ; and he must have been silent, or ashamed. After all, the Sum of Dr. *W*'s. Evidence, from his *Postnicene* Writers, amounts to no

* Ὅμηρος [οὐδεὶς] θεῖσται παλέων. Thal. Arii apud Athan.
de Synod. Arim. & Selenc. vid. & Epist. Arii apud Theodore.

† Εἰπεῖτωσαν ἡμῖν— παρεῖ πνΩθ + ἀγίων ἀκοστάτες συμ-
προφύκοντο— τὸ— θεληματι. De Decret. Synod. Nic.

‡ If any one has a Mind to see the concurrent Sense of Antiquity laid together in Respect of this Doctrine, he may consult the Notes which are added at the End of *Novatian*, publish'd by Mr. Jackson, p. 373—379.

|| Vid. adv. Arian. Orat. 4. p. 390. edit. Paris.

more than to prove (p. 238—240) the Son to be God (which is not deny'd) because the *Father* is God, which is no Proof at all: that the Name of *Father* implies a *Son*; yes it implies all Mankind to be his *Sons*, because he is the *Father of all*; and he farther pretends, that in their Opinion (tho they do not say so much) “the Son must be allow'd to be of the same Nature with the Father, and EQUAL in all essential Perfections.” That these Writers shou'd hold the *Consubstantiality* is no wonder; and tho *Hilary*, with the other *Athanasians*, profess'd it, he was far from allowing the Son to be equal to the Father in all essential Perfections. What thinks he of *Hilary's* Saying, * “herein, more especially, the Son is not compar'd or equall'd to the Father, as being subject to him by a Submission of Obedience—as being SENT by him; as receiving every Thing from him, and, in all Things, obeying the Will of him that SENT him”—adding, “that the Son is Subject to the Father by the Nativity of his Nature—again, is subject to the Father as the Original of his Existence.” Now was not *Hilary* a very proper Postnicene Writer for Dr. *W.* to alledge amongst others for his Notion, that the Son is equal to the Father in all essential Perfections? cou'd he have produc'd a Writer, even an Antenicene Writer, more strongly denying the Equality both of Nature and Perfections? *Fulgentius* and *Gregory Nyssen* speak more to this Purpose; but they are not only Writers of Lesser

* In eo quidem maxime non comparatur nec coæquatur Filius Patri, dum subditus per obedientia obsequelam est—dum mittitur, dum accipit, dum in omnibus voluntati ejus, qui semisit, obsequitur. *Hil. de Synod.*

Subjectum alterum alteri nativitate naturæ. Patrem in eo majorem esse quod Pater est, Filium in eo minorem esse quod Filius est — Patri subjectus est ut autori. *Ibid.*

Note, but the latter especially is a *Tritheist*, as the learn'd † Dr. Cudworth hath observ'd.

Besides, I would ask, with Respect to the two last, who seem to have thought that every Thing, or Perfection, belonging to the Father belong'd equally to the Son, I wou'd ask, whether these Writers thought the *Nature* or *Substance* of God the Father was *unoriginated*, or not ; and so, whether the *essential Perfections* of the Father were not all, with his *Essence* or *Substance*, *unoriginated* likewise ; if they are, whether they thought, or with what Reason they thought, the *Son* to be of the *same essential*, i. e. *unoriginated Nature* and *Perfections* with the Father. But if the *Nature* and *Perfections* of the *Son* were both *originated* from the *Father*, as they durst not deny that they were ; it follows that they cou'd neither be the *same*, or absolutely *equal*. The Thing is, the *Postnices*, talking of the Generation of the Son of God after the manner of *Humane Generation*, to which it wou'd admit of no Similitude or Comparison, run themselves into the most gross Absurdities and Impieties. The *Antenices* avoided all Offence, by taking care not to define the metaphysical *Nature* or *Substance* of the Son of God, and by asserting his Subordination, and the *Supremacy* of God the Father. One Passage from one of these Writers wou'd have more Authority and Weight in shewing the Sense of the ancient Church, than all the *Postnices* he has cited. But the Dr. having burned his Fingers sufficiently by meddling with them heretofore, it was but prudent in him, to be cautious of referring to them any more. However he ventures upon two Passages (p. 241, 243.) one of *Dionysius of Alexandria* cited by *Athanafius*, and the other of *Novatian*. But what

† *Intellect. System*, p. 603, 604.

does *Dionysius* say in the Place refer'd to, in which he is apologizing for some Expressions which he was charg'd to have us'd, and so is to say the most he can for Himself? Does he say that he ever taught the *Son* to be *the one God, the Supreme God, or equal to the Father?* Nothing like it: all that he says is, “ that the Son is [ἀιώνιος] eternal, or “ before the World—that he is inseparable from “ the Father—and that having been charg'd “ with making God the *Creator* of Christ—“ he says that having before stil'd him *Father*, he “ included the *Son* in Him.” In which Passage he does not deny that he made the *Son* a Creature at all, but intimates only that he cou'd not be suppos'd, to make him a Creature like the rest of the Creatures, because he thought him to be always *in the Father*. Now this is an evasive Apology; and his real Thoughts seem to have been, that the *Son* was always *in the Father*, as being the [λόγος ἐνδιάθετος] internal Word or Reason of God; but begotten *out of the Father*, as *Light from Light*, into a distinct real Person; and this *Generation* of the *Son*, by which he was a distinct subsisting Person, he had call'd a *Creation*, and in this respect made Christ a *Creature*, as he was accus'd of doing by the *Sabellians*. That this was his real Sentiment and Doctrine we learn from an unquestionable Witness, *Basil* a *Postnicene* and *Athanasian*, but a fair Writer; he tells us, that having read the Writings of this *Dionysius*, he did not * like several Things, that were in them; that he † thought him one, who laid the Seeds of the *Anomæan Opinion*; and that with respect to the *Consubstantiality*, he was ‡ faltering and unconstant, sometime holding it, and other Times rejecting it: more particularly, that he held

* *Bas. Epist. 41.*† *Ibid.*‡ *Ibid.*

“ * the

“ * the Father and Son to be not only *distinct Persons*, but of *different Substance*; and that the “ Son was *inferior* in *Power* and *Glory* to the *Father*.—And besides this, he spoke very un-“ becoming Words concerning the *Spirit*; not “ allowing him *divine Worship*, but depressing “ him into the Number of *created* and *ministring Beings*.” And † *Athanasius*, in his *Apology* for him, owns, that he did indeed use such Kind of Expressions. And ‡ *Photius*, another unsuspected Evidence, layeth the same Charge against him that *Basil* had done. † *Gennadius*, another *Athanasian*, does the same; and observes with *Basil*, that the *Arians* deriv'd their Notions from him.

As to *Novatian*, his other Author, his Writings are extant, on which Account Dr. *W.* should not have presum'd to have alledg'd him for his Notion, because the Reader, with his own Eyes, may see, that the whole most excellent Book of that ancient Writer is most full and express against his Doctrine of the Trinity, in Agreement with all the Remains of primitive Antiquity. He gives, in his last Chapter, the Sum of all his precedent Doctrine concerning God the Father, and the Son; and in this Chapter, the entire Doctrine of the primitive Church is so fully and clearly contain'd, concerning the *Supremacy* of the *Father*, as being alone *the one God* without *compare or equal*, and the *Subordination* and *Subjection* of the Son to him, as deriv'd from him by *his Will*, and as having receiv'd all his divine Power from him, and being *constituted*

|| Ὡν έπερότητα μόνον ὑποστέων τίθεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ γάρ τις δια-
φέρει, καὶ δυναμεῖς ὕφεσιν καὶ δόξην παρελλαγής—περὶ δὲ
τετοι, πεὶ τὸ πνεύματος αὐθίκη φωνὴ πώσα πρεπόντας τῷ πνεύ-
ματι, τὸ προσκυνεμένην αὐτὸν θεότητα ἐξοιζῶν, καὶ κατὰ πε-
τὴ κπῆ καὶ λαττεργῶ φύσει συναεθρῶν, ibid.

† *De Sentent. Dionysj. Sect. 4.*

|| *Cod. 232.* † *Lib. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 4.*

by him the *Lord* and *Head* of every Creature, but himself, with every Creature thus put under him, still *subject* to his Father, who is thereby declar'd to be the *one* and *only true God*. * This Doctrine of the primitive Church is so amply and excellently set forth by *Novatian*, as not only to deserve the most serious Attention and Consideration of every Christian, but to be alone sufficient to end all Disputes concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity.

* *Est ergo DEUS PATER omnium institutor & creator, SOLUS originem nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, æternus, UNUS DEUS, cuius neq; magnitudini, neq; maiestati, neq; virtuti, quicquam non dixerim præferri, sed nec comparari potest. Ex quo, QUANDO ipse VOLUIT, sermo Filius natus est.—Quin & Pater illum etiam precedit, quod necesse est prior sit, qua Pater sit: quoniam antecedat necesse est eum qui habet originem, ille qui originem nescit. Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habens originem quia nascitur.—Deus utiq; procedens ex Deo secundam Personam efficiens, sed non eripiens illud PATRI, quod UNUS est DEUS. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus comparatus cum eo qui est innatus, EQUATIONE in utroq; ostensa duos facheret innatos, & ideo duos facheret Deos—ÆQUALES inventi duos Deos merito redidissent— si invisibiliis fuisset, cum invisibili collatus PAR expressus duos invisibiles ostendisset, & ideo duos comprobasset & Deos. Si incomprehensibilis, si & cætera quæcunq; sunt Patris, merito, dicimus, duorum Deorum, quam isti configunt, controversiam susciasset.—Unus est omnium rerum & principium & caput—Filius autem nihil ex arbitrio suo gerit, nec ex consilio suo facit, nec a se venit, sed imperiis paternis omnibus & præceptis obedit, ut quamvis probet illum nativitas Filium, tamen morigera obedientia adserat illum paternæ VOLUNTATIS, ex quo est, MINISTRUM: ita dum se Patri in omnibus obtemperantem reddit, quamvis sit & Deus, UNUM tamen DEUM PATREM de obedientia sua ostendit, ex quo & originem traxit.—Deus solus Pater est, qui extra originem est.— Unus Deus ostenditur verus & æternus, Pater—Deus quidem ostenditur Filius, cui divinitas tradita & porrecta conspicitur; & tamen nihilominus UNUS DEUS Pater probatur—Filius autem cæterorum omnium Deus sit, quoniam omnibus illum Deus Pater præposuit quem genuit: ita mediator Dei & hominum Christus Jesus—concors Patri Suo DEO inventus, UNUM & SOLUM & VERUM DEUM, PATREM SUUM—approbat.*

Novat. c. 31. edit. Jackson.

To conclude this Head of the Doctrine of the ancient Church ; as nothing is more certain and evident, than that the ancient Church never taught the Doctrine of three equal, supreme, divine Persons of the same essential Perfections, or that God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, are the *only true God*, or *the same God*; or that the Son and Spirit, are each distinctly, as well as the Father, *the one God*, the Maker and Creator of all Things ; so on the contrary, the ancient Church always, and every where, taught, that there is but *one God* supreme over all, even over the *Son* and *Spirit*, viz. the *Father*; that the *Son* and *Spirit* were derived from the *Father*, as the original Cause of all, by his *Power*, *Will* and *free Pleasure*; that they are the inferior ministerial Agents, *By whom* he made the World ; and that in the Creation of the World, and in all the Dispensations of Divine Providence, they *always* acted by his *Authority*, and in *Obedience* to his *Will*; and that thus the *Father* being their *Lord* and *God*, there is and can be but *One God*. Our own learned Bishop *Pearson*, and Bishop *Bull*, both own, that the ancient Church placed the Unity in the *unoriginated Supremacy* of God the Father. I take no Notice that the primitive Fathers never stil'd the Holy Ghost *God* or *Lord*, that being a Matter of no great Moment, the Holy Ghost being truly a *divine Person*: nor do I take Notice that they did not scruple saying, the *Son* and *Spirit* were *created*, and *Creatures*, tho all other inferior Creatures were created *By them*: * this is most unquestionable of the most learned and eminent of the Ancients, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, the great *Origen* (whose Orthodoxy

* Vid. *Dissert. præv. ad Novat.* p. 47—51. edit. *Jackson.*
τρωπόκηπτες Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 591. vid. *Phot. Ced.* 109.
τίλεον πελεύς δημιεγγυημα. Euseb. Dem. Evang. lib. 4. c. 2.

never was suspected, or call'd in Question, even by his Enemies in his own Time, and whom Dr. W. allows to be undoubtedly Orthodox) *Dionysius of Alexandria*, *Theognostus* of the same Place, and *Gregory of Neocæsarea*, all *Origen's Scholars*, to which we may add, the most learned *Eusebius of Cæsarea*; and this they chiefly concluded from three Texts of Scripture, viz. *Prov. 8. 22.* *1 John 1. 3.* *Coloff. 1. 15.* But they plac'd the œconomy of the Trinity where the Scriptures place it; not in philosophical Notions of *Nature*, *Essence*, and *Substance*, but in the *Subordination* of the *Son* and *Spirit* to the *only true God* the Father supreme over all, in *Power*, *Authority*, *Dominion*, and *Worship*. As the Father alone was supreme by unoriginated Power and Authority, so he was the supreme and ultimate Object of Worship; and all *Prayers* and *Praises*, offer'd thro' the *Son* and *Spirit*, finally terminated in his Person, who is *above all, and in all, and thro' all*. If this was duly and piously consider'd, there wou'd be no Controversy about the Doctrine of the Trinity; all Scholastic Metaphysical Notions, which ought ever to enter into religious *Faith* or *Worship*, wou'd give Way to the plain Scripture-doctrine; and the Christian Church would be deliver'd from many gross and pestilent Errors.

Next Dr. W. (p. 246—355) gives his Reader a long Detail of old Heretics, condemn'd by the primitive Church, which, had I been in his Case, I wou'd not have said one Word about, because by plain Implication and Consequence, the Scholastic Trinitarian Notion is a Compound of all the first six Heresies, with the Addition of a seventh, worse than any of them. As to the seventh, mention'd by the Dr., he did not consider, that *Arius* flourish'd in the fourth Century, and so is not to be reckon'd amongst those, whose Opinions were censur'd by the ancient Church,

that
tenia
trin
T
cites
Bery
kno
Soci
Not
hold
taric
liani
dern
one
are t
the
disti
App
I tal
nitai
† P
tells
darin
supra
Chap
Son
God,
any

*
Statue
remon
lib. 4.
† H
est, e
rie nu
Filiu
|| A
Ezabe
Mysy

that being always meant of the pure uncorrupt *Ante-nicene Church*, which never condemn'd his Doctrine.

The Notions of all the Heretics which he recites, viz. *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, *Theodotus*, *Artemon*, *Beryllus*, *Paul of Samosata*, co-incided, and are known better by the Names of *Sabellianism* and *Socinianism*; but *Tritheism* (our Author's darling Notion) was too bad for any of these Heretics to hold. And that Dr. *W*'s and the modern *Trinitarian* Doctrine is made up of *Socinianism*, *Sabellianism*, and *Tritheism*, is most evident. The modern Scholastic *Trinitarians* consist of two Sects; one of which holds that the *Father Son* and *Spirit* are the *same individual Nature, Essence* and *Substance*, the *same numerical Being or Agent, the same God*, distinguish'd only * *modally* or *nominally*, by the Appellations of *Father, Son, and Spirit*. This Sect I take to be the most numerous Part of these *Trinitarians*: and this was the Heresy of *Beryllus*, and † *Paul of Samosata*, and *Sabellius*, who, as *Eusebius* tells us, was condemned for an *impious Heretic*, for daring to affirm Christ the Son of God to be || *God supreme over all*, which was the peculiar and essential Character of God the *Father*. They holding the Son to have no Divinity but of the *one supreme God*, i. e. the Father, deny'd virtually that he had any *Divinity of his own* [θεότητα *ἰδίαν*] any distinct

* Addo ego personam sine essentia concipi non posse, nisi statueris personam in divinis nihil aliud esse quam merum ὑπάρχειος, quod plane Sabellianum est. *Bull. Def. F. N.* lib. 4. p. 439.

† Patres, cum Paulus Samosatenus hæreticus pronunciatus est, etiam homousion repudiaverint: quia per hanc *unius essentie* nuncupationem, solitarium atq; unicum sibi esse Patrem & Filium prædicabat. *Hil. de synod.*

|| Αὐτὸς λω̄ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς· ὁ δὲ τολμῆσας φᾶναι τὸν Σαβέλλιον, ἢ ἐκκλησία τῷ θεῷ ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ βλασφήμοις ἔγκατε-*Mēs*, *Eccles. Theol. lib. 2. c. 4.*

personal Divinity, as * *Eusebius* relates of *Beryllus*. In like manner, these Scholastic Trinitarians, holding that the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of the one God and Father of all are the individual *Nature* and *Perfections* of the Son, &c. and leaving no Distinction of Nature and Attributes between them, do manifestly, with the fore-mention'd Heretics, *Beryllus*, *Sabellius*, and *Paul of Samosata*, deny the Divinity, the personal Divinity of Christ the Son of God. And farther, this Nation, which confounds the Persons of the Father and Son, does also by necessary Consequence make Jesus Christ (with the *Socinians*) a mere *Man*, in whom God the Father dwells; and by whom he has manifested his Will to Mankind; and thus it coincides with the Heresy of *Ebion*, *Theodotus*, and *Artemon*, who held Jesus Christ to be a mere *Man*, as the *Socinians* do. So that the modern Notion of the Trinity, which the Popish Schoolmen introduc'd, and chiefly prevails now, is only refining and mixing artfully together, by absurd Metaphysics, the foremention'd Heresies of *Sabellianism* and *Socinianism*.

Another Sect of the modern *Trinitarians*, few in Number in Comparison of the former, maintains with Dr. *W.* that the three divine Persons, *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*, are three distinct, independent, necessarily-existent, equally supreme, intelligent Agents; that the Divinity of the Son &c. is a distinct *acting principle*, co-ordinate with the Divinity of God the Father; and has all *essential Perfections* with his *Nature* or *Substance*, absolutely equal to, and co-ordinate with those of the Father: and that we may not doubt of their holding *Tritheism*, in the highest and strictest Sense, they say (if Christian Ears can bear such Blasphemy)

that the Son being *Son*, and being *sent* and *appearing* and *acting* in *Obedience* to the *Will* and *Commands* of God the Father, is not founded in any *natural*, *essential* or *real* Subordination of the Son to the Father in *Authority* and *Power*; but in a mere voluntary *Agreement* between the Father and the Son (as being distinctly co-ordinate in Nature and Perfections) to assume amongst Mankind different Names and Characters; for Dr. *W.* has nothing to say, * why the Son might not have been Father, but that in Fact he is not—and that there was no *Impossibility* in the *Nature* of the *Thing*, but that the Father himself might have acted the ministerial Part. So that according to Dr. *W*'s Orthodoxy, the Father might have been SENT from Heaven to do the Will of the Son, been made Flesh, and died in Obedience to the Son his heavenly Father; the Son might have been his God; have given to the Father all Power in Heaven and Earth; and as a reward for becoming Man, made him the *Mediator* between God and Man; exalted him to his own right Hand, and committed the Power of final Judgment to him. All which the Primitive Church declar'd to be most † *absurd*, *impious*, and *impossible*.

I 2

This

* Second Def. p. 177.

+ Οὐ τὸν ποιησὸν τὰν ὄλων καὶ πατέρα—πρόδιθαι πᾶς
ιστὸν καὶ μητέραν νὲν ἔχων, πολυῖστες εἰπεῖν. Justin. Ἀσεβεῖς.
Concil. Antioch. cont. P. Samosat. Visus est semper ex autoritate Patris. Tertul. ut merito nec descendat, nec ascendat,
[Pater] quoniam ipse omnia & continet & implet. Novat. solus originem nesciens, invisibilis [whom no man hath seen
nor can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16.] immensus, immortalis. Idem. Ab-
surdissime—missus diceretur [Pater] Augustin. propter
auctoritatem solus Pater non dicitur missus. Idem. See all the
Passages, and many more to the same Purpose, cited at length
in the Reply to Dr. Waterland's Defense, p. 9, 18, 59, 64, 78,
128, 132, 136, 137, 138, 141, 142, 145, 148, 149, 151, 157.
And Bishop Bull; qui Filium proprie dici posse αὐτῷ γενονται, hoc
est

This Doctrine is no less *denying** the Father and the Son [denying all real Distinction and Subordination between them] than that which St. John calls *Antichrist* (1 Jo. 2. 22.) And this also is that very *Spirit of Antichrist*, which confesseth not that *Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh.* 1 Jo. 4. 3. 2 Jo. 7. For if the Father, as Dr. W. admits, might have been *incarnate* (had it been so agreed) as well as the Son ; and if there is no *Possibility*, as all confess, for the Father to be *really incarnate*, but only (per assumptas species) by an *assumed Appearance*; it follows hence, that the Incarnation of the Son, who is (according to Dr. W.) equally as the Father the one God supreme over all, cannot be *real*, but *in Appearance only*, must be a mere *Manifestation* [whether in a *real* or *phantastical Body* only 'tis all one] and nothing more. Accordingly, in his Explication of Phil. 2. 7. he says, that Christ emptied Himself [*ἐκένωσεν εἰκοτὸν*, when he was incarnate] *in Appearance*. And farther as his Notion stands (if there is any Consistency in it) he must believe the Father to be as really incarnate as the Son ; because the Son, as He affirms, † being the *Substance of the Father*, and therefore the *Substance of the Father* being as much incarnate as the *Substance of the Son*, the Person also of the Father, which cannot be divided from his Substance, is as much incarnate as the Person of the Son. The Holy Ghost also must, according to this Notion, be incarnate, since he makes the Substance of the Father and Son the Substance likewise of the Holy Ghost : the three

est a seipso Deum, pertinaci studio contendunt : hæc sententia catholico consensui repugnat——piam ac studiosam juvenitatem seriò hortor, ut a spiritu sibi caveant, ex quo talia profecta fuerint. Def. Sect. 4. c. I. Sect. 7, 8.

* First Defense, p. 17.

† Ibid. p. 379, 380.

Persons, he says, * are all one Substance. So that either Way, and in spite of all his Evasions and Self-contradictions, the Heresy of the Gnostic *Dæcetæ*, who deny'd the Reality of our Lord's Incarnation and Sufferings, and were condemn'd by St. John as *Antichrist*, and always deservedly esteem'd the most infamous of all the old Heretics, stares him full in the Face. In Defense of this wretched Hypothesis it is that he says (p. 66.) " I can see no probable Reason why the Church of God shou'd be, as it were, first put under the immediate Conduct of the Father, then under the Son, and last of all under the Holy Ghost—when the Father might as well have had the sole Honour of all ; but upon the Hypothesis which I have hinted." I wou'd be glad to know, who first put under the Father the immediate Conduct of the Church of God. We read (*Ephes.* 1. 17, 22.) that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory—gave (Christ) to be the Head over all Things to the Church : and also gave the Holy Ghost to be a ministring Spirit to Christ, in the same Church. But it wou'd be monstrous to hear or read, that the Church was put under the Father, as if he was capable of being put into an Office, how high soever, who is Supreme over all. The Conduct of the Church therefore is solely the Father's by Original supreme Right, uncommunicated and uncommunicable to Him ; and the Son and Spirit are declar'd, in Scripture, to be subordinate and ministring Agents to Him in the Government of the Church ; and as the Son receives his Office in the Church, which is mediatorial, from the supreme underiv'd Authority of the Father, so, if Dr. W. will hear St. Paul, he must, at the End, deliver up this his (mediatorial) Kingdom to God, even the Father——and the

* First Defense, p. 378.

Son also Himself be subject unto Him who put all Things under Him, that God (even the Father, as he had said just before) may be all in all, 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. Does Dr. W. think it probable or possible for the Father (in order to have the sole Honour of all) to be sent and become incarnate, and to be *Mediator between God and Man*? What then does he mean by this strange Hypothesis, from which, one wou'd suppose, that either he had never read the Scriptures at all, or not regarded them at all. This is the Hypothesis of the Trinity, so altogether Antichristian, which He holds, and is so zealous to maintain by Church Censures against all, who differ from him. This is the Man so free in charging those with Heresy, who adhere to the Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity; whilst he himself maintains real Heresy shocking in the last Degree, and subversive of the great fundamental Principle both of *natural* and *reveal'd* Religion, the *Unity of God*. Let him clear Himself of this Charge if he can; he has been admonish'd over and over about it, and must not think to clear himself by high Pretenses and big Words; calling his Adversaries *Names*, and threatening what he wou'd do, if he had a *competent Authority*. There is in this (I cannot but think) something so presumptuous and infamous, by assuming in a Man, who is, in his Circumstances, and who is so deservedly above all others, liable to every Censure that is due to the Teachers of false Doctrine, the Deluders of Christians, and the Promoters of Contention, Strife and Division, as is unparalleled and even amazing. If he is so infatuated with the Love of Antichristian Error, as not to abide the Communion of *faithful Christians*, the Door is open, and he may, with his deluded Followers, leave that Church, which professeth the Scripture, and the Scripture only, to be

the Rule of its Faith ; and which has no Concern with his Hypothesis but to condemn it.

Having made this general Remark upon his History of Heresies, there is very little remains worth Notice.

He says (p. 247) “ the Sum of Cerinthus’s Heresy was, that Jesus and Christ were two Persons.” This was neither the Sum, nor the grossest Part, of his Heresy. The Sum of his Heresy really was, that having made Jesus and Christ, or the Word, two distinct Agents, or Persons, he separated them at the Passion, and affirm’d (as * Irenæus assures us) that Jesus (only) suffer’d, and rose from the dead, but that Christ remain’d impassible. The Sum of his Heresy and the very Essence of it, therefore, consisted in the denying that Christ really suffer’d ; in his making the Sufferings of Christ the Sufferings of a meer man, and denying the [Myos] Word, or Christ, to be passible. This is the Heresy which Irenæus every where chargeth him and his Followers with, and very largely confutes up and down in his Writings. There was very good Reason for Dr. W.’s dropping this principal Part of Cerinthus’s Heresy, and instead of it, amusing his Reader about other Points, quite foreign to the Purpose : indeed he wou’d have been much wiser had he drop’d the whole, or said nothing at all of Cerinthus ; because it is apparent, that Cerinthus’s Heresy is the very Image of his own in every Part of it.

Cerinthus, he observes, made Jesus (the humane Soul and Body) and Christ [the divine Word] two Persons : very right ; in Consequence he did so : and does not Dr. W. do the same ? Does he not suppose, the humane Soul and Body, or the Man Jesus, to be as distinct a Person from the Word,

* Jesum passum esse & resurrexisse ; Christum autem impassibilem perseverasse. lib. I. c. 26. edit. Maffuet.

the divine Person, as *Cerinthus* did? I defy him to shew any real Difference. *Cerinthus* held the two Persons *united* at the Baptism of Christ, Dr. *W.* holds them *united* about thirty Years before; and what signifies this Difference in a Point of meer Time? Two Agents, or Persons, originally and in Nature, distinct and continuing to exist, are two Agents, and two Persons, whether separate or united; whether united at one Time or at another. So that in *Cerinthus's* Scheme the divine and human Nature, Agent or Person, were as much one Agent or Person at the Baptism of Christ, as, in the Dr's Scheme, they were at the Birth of Christ; and are as much two Persons in his Hypothesis, as they were in that of *Cerinthus*.

Again, *Cerinthus* separated *Christ* from *Jesus*, the *divine* from the *human* Person, at the Crucifixion, that the *human* Person or *Man Jesus* only might suffer; the *divine* Person [*λόγος*] *Word*, or *Christ*, being, by him, thought *impassible*. In like manner, the Dr. supposes *Christ*, the *divine Word*, to be *impassible*, and the *meer Man Jesus* only to suffer: he supposes the *divine* Person to be present only to the *Sufferings* of the *meer Man Jesus*, but not really to partake of them, or to suffer, any more than *Cerinthus* did. *Cerinthus* could not see, but, that if the Union continued, *Christ* must suffer, whom he thought *impassible*; and therefore rather chose to separate the *divine* Person from the *Human*, than to make it *passible*: Dr. *W.* thinks (more absurdly in my Mind) that the Union might continue, and yet *Christ not suffer*: but both evidently agree in the main Point, which *Irenæus* condemn'd in *Cerinthus* as an Antichristian Heresy, namely, that the *Man Jesus* only suffer'd, and that *Christ*, the *Word*, remain'd *impassible*. And 'tis farther observable, that he makes no Difference in this Heresy, whether the Persons, *Jesus* and

and Christ were united or not. “ * If (says he) they alledge that they are united, nevertheless they declare that the one only suffer'd, and the other remain'd impassible.”

Had *Cerinthus* allow'd Christ the Word to be passible; and to have really suffer'd, *Irenæus* wou'd not have charg'd him with Heresy; for he insists upon it as a fundamental Point, that Christ the Word and Son of God did + really suffer; and argues that had the mere Man Jesus only sustain'd the Sufferings, the Value of them wou'd have been greatly diminish'd, and he wou'd have fallen short of the Sufferings of his Martyrs, if he their Lord and Master really suffer'd nothing.

The Dr. perhaps will say that the Man Jesus, or the Human Soul and Body in Christ, were not an human Person, tho' they constitute a Person in every other Man in the World: *Cerinthus* might with equal Reason have said the same, and been laugh'd at for it; as Dr. W. has been sufficiently expos'd for making this || Pretense. And shou'd he be so ridiculous as to say this again, there is

* *Et si unitos eos dixerint, iterum ostendunt eum quidem participasse passionem, hunc autem impassibilem perseverasse.* Lib. 3. c. 17. edit. Massuet.

† Μάθετε ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὅπ πιστεῖς ὁ παθῶν ψῆφος ἡμῶν, ὁ κατασκηνωτας ἐν ἡμῖν, ἀπό τος αὐτοῦ εἰσὶν ὁ λόγος τὰ θεῖα. Lib. 1. c. 1. Sect. 20. edit. Grab. ὁ λόγος τὰ θεῖα σὰρξ ἐγίνετο καὶ ἐπαθεύ. ibid. c. 4. invisibilis visibilis factus, & incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, & impassibilis passibilis, & verbum homo.—Si alter quidem passus est, alter autem impassibilis mansit—non unus sed duo monstrantur. lib. 3. c. 18. Here we see *Irenæus* charg'd *Cerinthus* with making Jesus and Christ two Persons, because he suppos'd Jesus the Man only to suffer, and Christ the Word to be impassible; which is exactly Dr. W's Notion.—Si enim non vere passus est &c—Patiens verbum Dei Patris &c. vid. Annot. ad Novat. p. 357—359. edit. Jackson.

|| See farther Remarks on Dr. W's farther Vindication. p. 36—40. by Phil. Cant.

still no Difference between him and *Cerinthius*, in the grand fundamental Point of the Sufferings of Christ the Son of God. The Scripture says, *the Lord of Glory was crucify'd* (1 Cor. 2. 8.) that he who was in the Form of God—*humbled Himself, and became obedient unto Death* (Philip. 3. 6, 8.) That the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect through Sufferings (Heb. 2. 10.) And as the Scripture never supposes Christ to be more than one Person, so it every where supposes this one Person Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, to have suffer'd for our Salvation. This was the Doctrine of *Irenæus* and * other Antients against the Heresy of *Cerinthius*; and this Doctrine, with the Scripture and primitive Fathers, we profess against Dr. W's Notion.

From what hath been observ'd it appears, that there is not one Egg more like unto another, than the *Cerinthian Heresy* is to Dr. W's Orthodoxy; and therefore I reserv'd *Cerinthius* to set him in the Dr's view, that in him he might see his own Face as in a Glass.

Another Thing to be observ'd is, that as before (p. 233.) the Dr. in Defense of his Notion, gave us a spurious Creed; so here (p. 269.) he puts upon us a spurious Text (1 Job. 5. 7.) Tho' the Text in itself, if it was genuine, is nothing to his Purpose, yet he must pardon me, if upon the occasion I put him in mind, instead of what St.

* "Οπως ἀδιψεν δη δι πατηρ τὸν ἑαυτὸν γὰρ καὶ εἰ τινῶς πεθεσιν ΑΛΗΘΩΣ γεγονέναι δι τῆς βεβελέται, καὶ μὴ λέγουσι δη ἐκεῖνος τὰς θεες γὰς εἰν εἰν αὐτελαμβάνετο τὸν γινομένον συμβαπτόντων αὐτῷ. Just. Mart. Dial. p. 104. τὰ ἔθνη μετανοῦσιν — ἀκίσσαντα τὸν αὐτὸν τὸν Αποστόλων αὐτῷ — μηρυχθέντα διατεταγμένη παθόντα ΛΟΓΟΝ. ibid. p. 106. ταῦτα πάθεα εἰ αὐτήν τὰς θεες ΛΟΓΟΣ. Hippol. cont. Noet. p. 16. edit. Fabri. And in some Creeds, God the Father was peculiarly characteriz'd as being impassible."

John does not say here, of what he really does say in another Place, *I testify to every one that beareth the Words of the Prophecy of this Book, if any one shall add to them, God will lay upon him the Plagues which are written in this Book.* Rev. 22. v. 18 ; that he may be sensible of the Danger of wilfully adding to the Word of God. That Text, which our Reformers (tho' dubious about it) admitted, but printed in a different Character, to signify its being wanting in the Original, has since, after the fullest Examination of it, been shewn to be an Interpolation in the sacred Writ, with a Degree of Evidence as clear and strong as ever was, or perhaps can be produc'd in a negative Point. It does not appear in any one *Greek Manuscript extant*, that is genuine or known to be older than printing ; besides that it is not once cited by any Antient Greek or Latin Writer, or Commentator. So that a Scholar, or one who has the least Knowledge of Manuscripts and Criticism, might be ashain'd to alledge it. Nor is this all in Dr. W's Case. I have good Reason to believe that he was convinc'd that St. John really wrote no such Text, when he first entered into the Controversy about the Doctrine of the Trinity ; and that on this Account he did not alledge it in his Writings. What new Light he has since or lately receiv'd, I will not pretend to know ; but hope that if he has receiv'd any, he will impart it unto us for our better Information : and I shou'd be sorry, if to serve a present Purpose, he has alledg'd it against the Conviction of his Conscience. This wou'd be making himself an immoral profligate Heretic indeed.

Nothing farther in this long Chapter of the Dr's remains to be observ'd but his saying (p. 319.) " that the Conduct of the Church with respect to the Praxeans, Noetians and Sabellians, is a

" Demonstration of the Truth of his Notion,
 " These Men charg'd the Church as teaching
 " three Gods. Then wou'd have been the Time,
 " and must have been, for the Church to declare
 " (had they ever meant it) that the *Father is God.*"

I shou'd be glad to know how this Objection of *Tritheism* is to be answer'd upon his Notion. He is so cautious as not to tell us how he answers it, because he knows he cannot answer it; and had he ventur'd to tell us truly how the Antients answer'd the Objection, it must have appear'd that they answer'd it so, as to confute and condemn his Notion at the same Time. He must then be a perfect *Novice* in the Writings of the antient Church, that does not know, or who does deny, that they did answer the Objection of Tritheism by asserting the *Unity* in the Person of the Father. They did constantly and invariably declare their Faith, that the *Father only is God*, i. e. God absolutely [*αὐτόθεος*] by supreme underiv'd Power and Authority; which being in Him alone, he was therefore the *one, only, and true God*. They never answer'd the Objection by asserting the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be one God, or the same God, or the supreme God*; or by saying that the *Son and Spirit were, distinctly, with the Father, each the one supreme God*; or *three consubstantial divine Persons, equal in Nature and all essential Perfections*: they were so wise as to know, that the first of these Assertions was coming into the very Notion of their Adversaries, and was that Assertion for which *Sabellius* was condemn'd by the Church as an *Atheist** and Blas-

* He had presum'd to assert Christ the Son of God to be (*ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς*) God supreme over all; this was the same as to assert, that he was the *Father*; the Church not teaching any other Person to be God supreme over all, but the *Father only*.

phemer; and that the latter was directly owning that Doctrine of Tritheism, with which the Sabellians had charg'd them. But they knew the Objection of three Gods cou'd not affect them, who taught that the Father only, as being unoriginated, was the one supreme God; that the Son tho' God cou'd not divide the Unity, because he was not absolutely and of Himself God; because he was begotten, deriv'd or produc'd, by the Will and Power of God the Father; therefore was inferior to him in Nature and Perfections; and always acted ministerially in Obedience to the [αὐθεντικὴ ἐξουσία] the Sovereign Authority of the one God and Father of all who is above all. This was the Answer which the antient Church made to the Objection of Tritheism, and it is the true Answer *. The Sense of the Antients I have thrown

And had they who taught the Son to be a distinct Person from the Father, at the same Time taught, that he was God supreme over all, they knew they must have taught two Gods, and have renounc'd Christianity thereby; being assur'd from Reason, as well as from Scripture, that two Persons, supreme over all, were undoubtedly two Gods. This Dr. W. never consider'd, and, as it seems, never will. See Euseb. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 4.

* Nos autem unum & solum veram Deum Doctorem sequentes—qui in novissimis temporibus Filium suum manifestavit. Iren. lib. 4. & 69. Solus unus Deus fabricator—hic Pater, hic Deus. lib. 2. c. 55. Ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & dominator omnium, tradente discipulis. lib. 3. c. 9. Quid erit unicum & singulare nisi cui nihil adæquabitur? quid principale, nisi quod super omnia, nisi quod ante omnia, & ex quo omnia? Hæc Deus solus habendo est, & solus habendo unus est. Tertul. adv. Hermog. c. 1. Si filius fuerit ei cuius monarchia sit, non statim dividi eam & Monarchiam esse desinere, si particeps ejus adsumatur & Filius: se proinde illius esse Principaliter, a quo communicatur in filium. adv. Prax. c. 3. Si enim natus non fuisset, innatus—equatione in utroq; ostensa, duos ficeret innatos, & ideo duos faceret Deos. Novat. c. 31. see the whole Chapter. λεκτέον γὰς ἀντίς ὅπ τότε μὲν ΑΓΓΟΘΕΟΣ ὁ θεός εἰσι, &c. Orig. Com. in Jo. p. 46. ἐδὲ δύο θεοὶ ἀνάγκη δέναι τὸν τὰς δύο ὑποσάστας πλέυτα. ἐδὲ γὰς δύο ΙΣΟΤΙΜΟΥΣ αὐτὰς οἱ βόρειοι, &c. Euseb.

Eccles.

thrown into a Note below, for the Use of the Learned Reader ; and shall conclude this Head with *Athanasius's* own Answer to the Objection, who was not altogether so deeply immers'd in *Tritheism* as *Dr. W.* is. “ * The Father does all “ Things By his Word, In the Holy Spirit ; and “ thus the Unity of the holy Trinity is preserv'd : “ and thus there is one God preach'd in the Church, “ who is above all, and through all, and in all : Above “ all as being the Father, the Original and Foun-“ tain ; Through all By [Through] his Word ; “ in all in the Holy Ghost. This Doctrine, he “ adds, was deliver'd from the Beginning, and “ is the Faith of the Catholic Church, which was “ given by the Lord ; which the Apostles “ preach'd ; and the Fathers preserv'd : on this “ the Church is founded ; and he that falls away “ from this [Faith] can neither be, nor be esteem'd, “ a Christian.” And it must be confess'd, that *Athanasius* never contradicted this, by venturing to assert that the Son was absolutely *the one or only God*.

But now what says *Dr. W.*, for the Church, to the Objection of *Tritheism*? He has nothing at all to say to the Point, and therefore he says ; “ They distinguish'd themselves off from *Sabellianism*, “ but so as to avoid the other extreme after-“ wards call'd *Arianism*.” How poor, low, and unscholar-like, is this Defense of the antient Church ? as if they had nothing to say for themselves, but like a modern scholastic Quibbler distinguish'd themselves off, as he wou'd do if he cou'd.

Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 7. Auctoritate innascibilitatis Deus unus est. *Hil. de Synod.* Veteres Deum Patrem, eo quod Principium, Causa, Auctor & Fons Filii sit, unum illum & solum Deum appellare non sunt veriti : sic enim ipsi patres Nicæni exordiuntur suum Symbolum ; credimus in unum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, &c. *Def. F. N. a Bullo.* § 4. c. 1.

* *Epist. 1. ad Serap.*

Why

Why does he not let his Reader know from their own Words, how they *distinguish'd* themselves off from *Sabellianism*? No ! that was not to be done without discovering at the same Time, that the Orthodoxy of the antient Church was of quite another sort from his Orthodoxy ; and that his Orthodoxy was esteem'd by them a greater Heresy than *Sabellianism*. It was enough for him therefore to say, that they avoided what was afterwards call'd *Arianism* ; knowing his Admirers to be such, that any Thing will go down with them, and that a mere *Word* at any Time is as good for them as a real Argument. But if I shou'd not be too troublesome to him, I wou'd ask him what *Arianism* is : and will venture to say, that if he once fairly and truly sets it before his Reader, it will appear not to be what he has hitherto call'd by that Name ; and that the Game which he has been playing many Years, has been to decry the Catholic Doctrine of the primitive Church, under the feign'd Name of *Arianism*, in order to give a better Colour to his own Doctrine, as if favour'd by it, tho' it is certain (as I have already shewn, and shall farther prove presently) that it is a Doctrine which they detested as the rankest *Heresy*, and as bad as *Atheism*.

His seventh Chapter (p. 355—467.) which is to shew the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, might have been of some Service to his Cause, had he shewn before, that the Fathers of the antient Church, in their Creeds or Writings, had ever countenanc'd it ; but since he is not able to shew so much as an Appearance of any Evidence from them on his Side, the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity only serves to expose and condemn the more a Doctrine, which is utterly opposite to the constant, unanimous, and universal Sense of the primitive Church. What is here said

hath been in good Measure already prov'd ; but in order to a Conclusion, I will briefly set before the Reader the Sense of the antient Church, with respect to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in their Interpretation of some principal Texts of Scripture relating to it. And this will give me very little Trouble. And to shew how fair I intend to be, I will begin with the Consideration of those Texts which he thinks most to his Purpose.

John 1. 1, 2, 3. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; the same was in the Beginning with God : all Things were made by him, &c.*

In the Interpretation of these Words, tho' easy enough in themselves, there are several Things observable.

1st. Here are indisputably two distinct divine Agents, two acting Beings, according to Dr. W's own Sense, who owns that a Person is an intelligent Agent *. One of the Persons, stil'd the *Word*, is distinguish'd from the other stil'd absolutely (*ο θεός*) *God*; as having been with God in the Beginning, i.e. of the Creation of the World; and as being the Person † by (*δια* thro') whom all Things were made.

2dly. It is observable, that St. John does not here stile the Word *God*, or say that *he is God* (as neither doth he say so any where else) but says, that in the Beginning *he was God*; meaning (as all the Antients have observ'd) that before his Incarnation, and from the Beginning of the World, he was God, or the divine Person who appear'd to *Adam*, the *Patriarchs*, &c. as the *Messenger*, *Word*, *Angel* and *Representative* of the most high *God*; of Him whom

* Second Defense, p. 175, 366, 367.

† Ἐστι μὲν ὑφ' ἐπὶ τὸ αἰπον—Δι' ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ ἐργαλεῖον.—ἀλλα
μὲν αὐτῷ [κόσμῳ] τὸν θεὸν ὑφ' ἐγένονται;—οὗτοι αὐτοὶ δὲ λέ-
γοι θεοί, Δι' ἐκπεσκεώθησαν. Phil. Jud. lib. de Cherub.

St. John here styles emphatically and absolutely ($\delta\theta\epsilon\sigma$) God; appearing and acting ministerially in the * Name, and by the Authority, of the supreme God: because it was impossible in itself, and impious to suppose the most high God, the God of the Universe, whom no one hath seen or can see, 1 Tim. 6. 16. to appear Himself in Person. This Character the *Word* laid aside, when he was made *Flesh*, v. 14. but instead of it receiv'd a greater, more glorious, and divine Name, being then declar'd the only begotten of the Father, and our Lord and Saviour.

This was a more eminent Character than being merely the *Word* of God, who as being the *Angel* of God, and the Revealer of his Will, had been stil'd God. Other Angels had the Title of God given them; but unto which of the Angels said he at any Time, *Thou art my Son, &c.* Heb. 1. 5. And when Christ was invested with this Character of the only-begotten, then it was commanded, that all the Angels of God shou'd worship him, v. 6. And after his Resurrection from the Dead, when all Power was given him both in Heaven and Earth, he then was declar'd to be the Son of God with Power; was highly exalted, and had a Name given him which is above every Name, that every Tongue shou'd confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord (of Angels as well as Men) to the Glory of God the Father, Phil. 2. 9, 11. Having a Personal Dominion given him, and being constituted, as Son of God, the Head over all Things to the Church, he was then made

* Cujus auctoritate & nomine ipse erat Deus——visus est semper ex auctoritate Patris. Tertull. In nomine Dei variè visum patriarchis, Tertull. Ἀγαλαμβάνω τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς πατέρες γένεις τῷ οὐλῶν ὑπὲ παρεγένετο εἰς τὸν παραδίκουν ἐν πρεστὶ τῷ Θεῷ, Theoph. ad Autolyc. Τὸν μὲν θεὸν τῷ οὐλῶν ἀπεβήσας ἀγέλων γονίστις καλεῖσθαι. Synod. Antioch. adv. Paul. Samosat.

Lord over all, which imply'd his being *God* in a far higher Sense, than when he acted from the Beginning, merely ministerially as the Angel of God and *Word* of God. This shews the Reason why St. John chose to say of the *Word*, not that *he is*, but that *he was God*.

3. The Evangelist says, *all Things were made By (διε through) Him*; that is, he was the *ministerial Agent*, *By whom God made the World*; whence it is infer'd, that he was really subordinate, in *Power* and *Authority*, to him who is stil'd *God (ο θεος)* *absolutely*; and who by *Original, Supreme, underiv'd Power*, made all *Things By his Word*.

Where is the Heresy of this Exposition? Or who can find out from the Words of the Apostle, that the *Word* who was *with God*, and *By whom all Things were made*, is (as Dr. W. inviolably maintains, p. 470.) *the same God with the Father*; *the same God with Him, with whom he was in the Beginning; the same God with Him who made all Things By Him?* This is Dr. W's avow'd Sense; for which he gives no better Reason than the stale exploded Pretense, that if he is not *the same God with the Father*, he must be *another God*, and in Consequence there must be *two Gods* (p. 472.) as much as to say, that Christ must either be the *same God*, i. e. the same Agent or Person with the *Father*, or else, if God at all, he must be another distinct, equally supreme, unoriginated Agent, Person or God; which indeed and nothing else, as hath been fully shewn, is properly *two Gods*, and was always so understood by the antient Church.

Dr. W. himself does not really mean, that the Son is *the same God*, i. e. the same individual *Being or Agent*, with the Father; he makes Him as much a distinct *acting Substance or Agent*, as his Opposers do. If then he is not thus *the same God*

God with the Father in *Dr. W's Sense*, how will *Dr. W.* himself avoid that Consequence, which he charges on his Adversaries Notion, of making *two Gods*? If he says that the Union of the distinct acting Substance of the Son, or of his Person, to the distinct acting Substance, or Person, of the Father makes them *the same God*, his Adversaries [if they wou'd take the Liberty of quibbling and playing with *Words* without *Sense*, as he does] might say the same ; for they suppose as close and intimate an *Union* between the Father and the Son, as *Dr. W.* does or can do. But they know that *two Gods*, howsoever united, are as much *two Gods* as if not united, they are and must be *two united Gods*. So that *Dr. W.* is plainly entangled in his own Objection, and not only makes the Father and Son *two Gods*, as much as his Opposers do ; but much more does he make them *two Gods*, making them so in the strict and proper Sense of *Ditbeism*, as making them *two equal, supreme, independent Agents*, i. e. *two supreme Gods*.

On the other Hand his Adversaries are clear of this Charge. For as the *Angels* (and even *Men*) whom the Scripture stiles *Gods*, are neither the *same God* with the one God the Father, nor are *other Gods* in Distinction to him, or with the one God the Father make *many Gods* ; because they are the *Ministers* of the one God, and act by his *Authority* : so much more neither does Christ, by being stil'd *God*, who is the *Son of God*, and Sent by the *one God* the Father, and who always acts in Obedience to the *Will* of him his *Father* and *God*, make it be infer'd either that he is *the same God* with the Father, or that there are *two Gods*. It is the *Sovereign unoriginated Power and Dominion* of the *one God and Father of all, who is above all*, from whom *Men and Angels* and the *Son Himself* is deriv'd, and from whom they receive

that Power and Authority, on Account of which they are call'd *Gods*, that preserves the *Unity* of *God* and *Monarchy* of the Universe in his Person, who is alone *Supreme over all*.

Next he invidiously, and also inconsistently, charges his Adversaries with making the *Word*, or *Christ*, a *Creature* of the great *God*. (p. 472.) For if they make him a *Creature*, how contradictory is it to charge them at the same Time with making him *another God*? For how shou'd the *Word*, if a *Creature* stil'd *God*, be *another God*, or make with the Father *two Gods*, any more than *Angels*, who are *Creatures* stil'd *Gods*, make with the Father *many Gods*? He is not aware what a foul Imputation he casts upon the Scriptures by the inconsistent Charge, which thro' a blind and perverse Zeal he throws upon his Opposers; who say no more than the Scripture says, and build all their Faith upon it.

Again, How does he prove that his Opposers make *Christ* a *Creature*? Or what does he mean by their making him a *Creature*? Do they say, or does any Thing they say imply, that the *Son* or *Word* of *God* is one of those *Creatures* which *God* made *By Him*? This is too absurd a Charge for even *Dr. W.* himself to lay upon them. Are there then other *Creatures* besides those which were made *By the Word*? let him tell us who they are, and where they are mention'd. Therefore it is very *unfair* in *Dr. W.* to charge his Adversaries with making the *Son of God* a *Creature*, because they do not think him to be the *one God and Father of all*. It is also very *inconsistent*; because if there is no Medium between the *one Supreme Unoriginated God* and a *Creature*, then *Dr. W.* who does not say, nay, who in Words [how contradictory soever] denys the *Son of God* to be *unoriginated*, does himself also make him a *Creature*,

as well as his Opposers do: but if there is a *Medium* between the one supreme *unoriginated* God and a *Creature*, then the Opposers of Dr. W. beg his Leave to think and to say, that Christ the *Word* and *Son of God*, is such a * *middle Person*: and why does not Dr. W. say (as he thinks his Adversaries say or ought to say) in plain Terms, either that the *Son of God* is *unoriginated, unbegotten*, and *underiv'd*, or that he is a *Creature*?

Having thus shewn the Interpretation of the Text before us, and withal how absurd Dr. W's Explication of it is, and also how weak, frivolous, and contradictory, his Inferences are against our Interpretation; I proceed to set before the Reader the full Sense of the antient Church, on this Text, that he may judge thereby whether Dr. W's. Explication, or that which I have given, is most agreeable to the Sense of the antient Church. And in this matter I will chuse, out of Favour to Dr. W., to begin with the Exposition of the most learned *Origen*, because Dr. W. assures us (p. 310.) that " *Origen's Orthodoxy in the Article of Christ's Divinity has been abundantly vindicated, and clear'd from all reasonable Exception.*" I desire he'll remember that he has said this; for I intend to give him enough of *Origen*, whom, I assure him, I admire for his Orthodoxy, as much as he can do.

Origen then says upon the Text, " *The Word was with God, and again, the Word was God.*

* Alexander, the famous Bishop of Alexandria who condemned *Arius*, says expressly, that the only begotten Son of God is a *middle Nature* between the *unbegotten Father*, and those *Creatures* which he made *By the Word*. Ἀγνοῦντες οἱ αὐτόκητοι, οἱ μακεδόνες ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ πάλεος αἰγανήτῳ καὶ θρῷ κποθευτῶν ὑπὸ αὐτῷ ἐξ ὅντων λογικῶντες καὶ ἀλόγων, οὐ ΜΕΣΙΤΕΤΟΥΣΑ ΦΤΣΙΣ μονογενῆς, διὸ οὐ τὰ σόλα ἐξ ὅντων ἐπίσημον οἱ πατὴρ; Τίνι λόγῳ. Epist. apud Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. I. c. 4.

" John very carefully, and as not being ignorant
 " of the accurate Nature of the Greek Language,
 " sometimes useth the Articles, and sometimes
 " omits them: adding the Article in the Appel-
 " lation, ($\delta\lambdaόγος$) *the Word*; but in the Appel-
 " lation ($\thetaεός$) *God*, sometimes adding it, and
 " sometimes, for Distinction sake, omitting it.*
 " He applies the Article when the Title God de-
 " notes Him, who is the *unoriginated Author* of
 " *Universe*; but he drops it when *the Word* is
 " call'd *God*. And as in these Places (of the E-
 " vangelist) there is a Distinction made between
 " him who is *absolutely God* ($\delta\thetaεός$) and Him who
 " is simply ($\thetaεός$) *God*; so observe whether there is
 " not the like Difference between *the Word* ($\delta\lambdaόγος$)
 " with the Article, and *the Word* ($\lambdaόγος$) with-
 " out the Article: for as he who is *the God over*
 " *all* is *God absolutely* [$\delta\thetaεός$] and not simply *God*
 " [$\thetaεός$] so the Fountain of that Reason which is in
 " every rational Being, is *absolutely Reason* [$\delta\lambdaόγος$]
 " the particular Reason of every rational Being
 " not being stil'd properly, and in like manner,
 " with the Fountain of Reason [$\delta\lambdaόγος$] *absolutely*
 " *Reason*.—To those who apprehended it might

* ————— πίθησ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἄρθρον, δῆτε δὲ θεός ὄνομασία δῆ
 το αἰγαλήτῳ πάσσεται σθινότων αὐτοῖς· σιωπᾶ δὲ αὐτὸ δῆτε δὲ λόγοθ
 θεός ὄνομαζεται. ως δὲ μαρφέραι κατὰ τάττες τὸς τόπου ο'
 ΘΕΟ'Σ καὶ θεός, ὅτως μήποτε μαρφέρη 'Ο ΑΟΓΟΣ καὶ λόγοθ.
 ὃν τεχόπον γὰρ δὲ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός 'Ο ΘΕΟ'Σ, καὶ ἐχει αὐτῶς θεός,
 ὅτως η πηγὴ τὸ εν ἐκάστῳ σθινότων λογικῶν λόγος 'Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ· τὸ εν
 ἐκάστῳ λόγος εκ αὐτῶν κωείως, διώσις τῷ πρῶτῳ, ὄνομασθέντος καὶ
 λεχθέντος, 'Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ. The Force of Origen's Reason-
 ing cannot be so clearly understood without some Knowledge
 of the Greek Language, in which the Articles are often very
 emphatical. But his Sense is evident, that God the Father only
 is *absolutely God over all*; and the *Word* barely stil'd *God*;
 the Difference between them being, according to Origen, the
 same, as between *she Word*, whom he supposes the Fountain of
 that inferior Reason which is in rational Beings, and the in-
 ferior Reason of those rational Beings, as he expressly after-
 wards says. *Com. in Joh.* p. 46, 47.

“ be infer’d from the Title of God being ascrib’d
 “ both to the supreme God over all, and to the
 “ Word, that there were two Gods, he remarkably
 “ says, * that he who is God self-existent is (alone)
 “ properly and absolutely God; wherefore our Sa-
 “ viour says, in his Prayer to the Father, that they
 “ may know thee, the only true God. But every Be-
 “ ing, besides him who is God self-existent, receiving
 “ his Divinity by Communication from him, is
 “ not ($\delta\ \theta\epsilon\sigma$) God absolutely; but may more pro-
 “ perly be itil’d ($\theta\epsilon\sigma$) a divine Person.” He adds,
 “ There was He who is absolutely God, and He
 “ who is simply God; then Gods in a twofold
 “ Sense [viz. Angels, who are Gods by Participa-
 “ tion of Divinity, or those who are call’d Gods,
 “ but really are not, i. e. the Heathen Deities] the
 “ superior Order of which Deities [the Angels]
 “ is excell’d by God the Word, who is Himself
 “ excell’d by Him, who is absolutely the God of the
 “ Universe.”

Eusebius, the Learned Bishop of Cæsarea, makes the same Distinction between the Word who is God simply and without the Article, and the Father who is God absolutely with the Article. Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra had asserted that Christ was [$\delta\ \theta\epsilon\sigma$] God absolutely; Eusebius oppos’d him with the Passage of St. John before us, observing, “ † that according to the Pretence of Marcellus,

the

* Λεκτέον γάδε αὐτοῖς ὅτε τόπε μὲν αὐτόθεος ὁ θεὸς ἐστι. δίόπερ
 χάρι Σωτήρ φυσιν ἐν τῇ περὶ τὸ πατέρα ἐνχῆ, ἵνα γινώσκωσι σε-
 τὸ μόνον αληθινὸν θεόν· πᾶν δὲ τὸ τῷ θεῷ τὸ ΑΥΤΟΘΕΟΣ, με-
 ποχ τῆς ἔκεινος θεότητος θεοποιήμενον, εἰκόνα Ο ΘΕΟΣ, ἀλλά θεοὶ^{καὶ}
 καθεύτερον ἀν λέγοιτο. ——ιώ γάδε Ο ΘΕΟΣ χάρι θεὸς, εἴτα θεοὶ^{ληγο-}
 κοις (Scil. θεοὶ μετέχοντες θεῖ, i. e. Angeloi ex c., ή λεγο-
 κοις μὲν, ἄδειμοις δὲ ὄντες θεοι. i. e. Dii Ethnicorum, p. 48.)
 οὐ τὸ κρέττονος πάγματος ὑπερέχει ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ΤΙΠΕΡΕΧΟ-
 ΜΕΝΟΣ ὑπὸ τῆς σῇ σλων θεοῦ. Com. in Joh. p. 46, 47, 49.

† Κατ’ αὐτὸν, τὸ ἐν αρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, ἵσσον τίνει τοῦ, ἐν
 ἡχῇ ἦν Ο ΘΕΟΣ. ω̄ το, ω̄ ὁ λόγος ἦν περὶ τὸ θεόν ἵσσον

" the Saying in the Beginning was the Word (ονομασίας) wou'd be the same as to say, in the Beginning was (οντός) he who is God absolutely ; and the Saying, and the Word was with God, the same as to say, he who is God absolutely was with Him who is God absolutely [or, according to Dr. W., the same God was with the same God] and the Saying, the Word was God, the same as to say, that he who is (οντός) God absolutely, is (θεός) simply God, i. e. God not absolutely. All which he concludes, is inconsistent and absurd." The Reason he adds is, that the Word, being not unoriginated as the Father is, cannot be absolutely God ; therefore the Evangelist* did not stile him God absolutely with the Article, *lest it should be infer'd that he was supreme God.*

Methodius says ; " + that the Word, By whom all Things were made, is the Original of other Things, next after the Father, who is his unoriginated Original."

Having seen how the most learned of the Antients understood and distinguish'd upon the first Verse of St. John's Gospel, never in the least imagining the Word or Son to be the same God with the Father, or the supreme God, whom they constantly declar'd to be the Father only ; I shall next shew, that in their Explanation of the third Verse, *all things were made by him*, they unanimously understood the Word, or Christ, to be the ministerial Agent, who, in the Creation of the World, acted

ένει πνεύμα, καὶ οὐ ΘΕΟΣ ἦν πρὸς τὸν ΘΕΟΝ· ὥμοιως δὲ καὶ τοῖς ταῦταν ένει πνεύμα καὶ θεός ἦν οὐ ΘΕΟΣ. ἀλλὰ δὲ πρὸς τὴν αὐτοποίησιν καὶ παρεγγέλογέτατα εἴη αὐτόν.—

* Οὐκ εἰπὼν καὶ οὐ λόγος ἦν οὐ ΘΕΟΣ μετά τοῦ προφήτης, ἵνα μηδὲ ταῦταν ένει ποντὸν ΕΠΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ (ΘΕΟΝ) οἰεῖσθαι. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 14.

† Οὐκέτι αὐτῷ, ΜΕΤΑ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀναρχὴν αὐτῷ τὸ πατέρευς αὐτὸς οὐδὲ ἄλλων γίνεται, διὸ οὐδὲ παντα δημιουργεῖται. De creatis.

in Subordination and Obedience to the sovereign Will and Command of the Father, as the supreme God of the Universe.

I shall, again, begin with *Origen**. “ The Expression, *By him*, (says he) never imports the first (principal) Place, but always the second Place—thus therefore, if here all Things are made *By the Word*, they are not (originally) OF the Word ; but are (originally) OF him, who is superior to, and greater than, the Word : and what other can this Person be but the Father ?”

Origen's Master, Clemens of Alexandria, had said before him, “ † There is one unbegotten Being, God supreme over all ; and one first-begotten Being, *By whom* all Things were made—for as Peter writes, there is indeed but one God, who made (or constituted) the Beginning of all Things, meaning his First-born Son,” who is the Beginning of the Creation of God, *Rev. 3. 14*.

Irenaeus, contemporary with *Clemens*, upon the Words says ; || “ By him (of or from him, as the

M efficient

* Οὐδὲποτε τὴν πρώτην χάρεαν ἔχει τὸ, Δι' ἐξ, δευτέρεαν δὲ αἰτ. — ἐπω τοῖνυν καὶ ἐνθάδε εἰ πάντα Διὰ τὸ λόγος ἐγένετο, ἢ ΤΠΟ τὸ λόγος ἐγένετο, αλλὰ ναὸς ΚΡΕΙΤΤΟΝΟΣ καὶ ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟΣ ἐστὶ τὸν λόγον· τὸς δὲ σὺν αἰλλῳ ἐτῷ πυγχάνῃ οὐδὲ μῆρ. *Com. in Jo. p. 55, 56.*

† EN μὲν τὸ αἰγάννητον, ὁ παντοκρέτως θεὸς, EN δὲ καὶ τὸ περιγεννηθὲν, Δι' ἐξ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.—εἴς γα περ ὅντι ἐσιν ὁ θεὸς, ὃς αἰρετὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ἐποιοῖσεν, μηνύων τὸ πρωτόγονον καὶν, ὁ Πέτρος γεράρει, *Strom. 6. p. 644. edit. Paris.* In this Passage I have render'd the Word *ἐπινοεῖται*, *made or constituted*, it not appearing, I think, certainly from the Passage, and *Clemens's* Observation upon it, in which of the Senses *Clemens* understood it; tho' it is certain that *πρωτόγονον* here is with him the same as *πρωτόκτισον*, *first created elsewhere*: and 'tis well known, that he believed the Son to be a *Creature*. And yet his Orthodoxy is no more to be doubted of than his Scholar *Origen's*, for whose Orthodoxy *Dr. W.* is a Voucher.

|| AB eo qui super omnes est Deus & constituta sunt & facta PER verbum ejus, Johannes quidem sic significavit—omnia

“ efficient Cause) who is *God over all*, they were
 “ both appointed and made (per) *By*, or *Thro'*,
 “ his Word” [as the ministring Cause] For he
 there observes; “ *David* added, he commanded
 “ and they were created: whom then did he com-
 “ mand? namely, *the Word*, *By* [per, *Thro'*]
 “ *whom the Heavens were made.*”

And according to *Irenæus*, * “ *He who com-*
 “ *mands* is greater and *superior* to him who is *com-*
 “ *manded*; because the one bears *Rule*, and the
 “ *other is Subject.*”

Again, *Clemens of Alexandria* having asserted,
 the Father to be the first or supreme Cause in the
 Creation, adds, † “ *that the Son is the second*
 “ *Cause, By whom all Things were made accord-*
 “ *ing to the Will of the Father.*”

Theophilus, Bishop of *Antioch*, says, ‡ “ *God*
 “ *had the Word to be the Minister of those Things*
 “ *which were made by him (as the efficient Cause)*
 “ *and made all things By him.*”

And *Tertullian*, || “ *The Son was the Person*
 “ *who always appear'd, convers'd and act'd, by the*
 “ *Authority and Will of the Father, because, the*
 “ *Son can do nothing of himself, (Jo. 5. 19.)—thus*
 “ *all things were made By the Son.*”

per eum facta sunt. — David — adject: quoniam ipse
præcepit & creata sunt, &c. Cui ergo PRÆCEPIT? VERBO
scilicet, PER quod, inquit, Cœli firmati sunt, &c. [Psal. 33. v.
6.] lib. 3. c. 8.

* Τὸ κελένον τῷ κελευμένῳ μεῖζόν τε καὶ κνειώπερον, ἐπὶ^{τὸ μὲν πεγγύεται, τὸ δὲ περτετάκται.} (leg. vel. περστέτακται,
 vel ut edit. Massuet. ὑποτετάκται.) lib. 1. c. 9.

† Τὸν γὸν δὲ δέντερον, Δι' ἐπάντα ἐγένετο κατὰ βέλην τὸν
 πατρός. Strom. 5. p. 598. edit. Paris.

‡ Τὴν τὸν λόγον ἔχει ὑπεργὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῷ γεγενημένων,
 καὶ Δι' αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα πεποίηεν. ad Autolyc. p. 81.

|| *Filius visus est semper, & Filius conversatus est semper, &*
Filius operatus est semper, ex auctoritate Patris & voluntat,
quia Filius nihil a semetipso potest facere—sic omnia per Filium
facta sunt. Adv. Prax. c. 15.

Origen explaining the Words of the Psalmist (Psl. 33. 9.) for he spake, and they were made, he commanded, and they were created, as the Greek Translation has it; says, * "The unbegotten God commanded the first-born of every Creature, and they were created——," whence, he says, "It appears, that the Word, being the Minister of the Creator, fram'd the World."

On the same Account, he says, in another Place; † "The Son is the immediate Framer, and, as it were, Artificer of the World, but the Father, in commanding the Word his Son to make the World, is primarily Creator."

And the Council of Antioch, who met to condemn Paul of Samosata, declare their Faith saying; ‡ "We believe, that he (the Son) having been always with the Father, fulfill'd the Father's Will in the Creation of the Universe."

Eusebius in like manner distinguisheth and says, "|| The Evangelist, in saying sometimes that

M 2

"the

* Ἐνείλατο ὁ ἀγέννωτος θεὸς τῷ πρωτοτόκῳ πάσις κλίσεως, καὶ ἐκπίσθησαν, &c. —ἀποδέκνυται ὅπ ύπηρέτης τῷ δημιουργῷ γένεσος ὁ λόγος τὸν κόσμον κατεσκεύασε. Com. in Job. p. 61.

† Δέγοντες τὸν μὲν περσεχῆς δημιουργὸν εἶναι τὸν οὖν τε βεβ λόγον, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ αὐτοργὸν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν δὲ πατέρα τε λόγον, τῷ περιεταχέναι τῷ οῷ ἔσυτε λόγῳ ποιῆσαι, τὸν κόσμον, ἔναις, πρώτως δημιουργόν. Cont. Cels. lib. 6. p. 317.

‡ Τέτον πισένομεν σὺν τῷ πατεῖ ἀεὶ ὄντα ἐκπεπληρωμένατο πλεικὸν βέλημα περὶ τὴν κλίσιν τῶν ὅλων. Synod. Antioch. Non alium ostendit iunc adfuisse Deo cui præciperentur hæc opera ut fierent, nisi eum per quem facta sunt omnia, sc. Novat. c. 17. edit. Jackson.

|| Λέγων δὲ (Εὐαγγελιστής) Δι' αὐτῆς γεγεννήθας ποτὲ μὲν τὸν κόσμον, ποτὲ δὲ τὰ πάντα, τὸ ὑπερεικὸν τῷ θεῷ (λόγῳ) παίσιοι. Δυναίμενος γάν τὸν Εὐαγγελιστής εἰπεῖν πάντα ΓΠ' αὐτῇ γένεσο— ἐχ ὑπ' αὐτῇ ἐφη, ἀλλὰ Δι' αὐτῇ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἀγαγῆμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅλων ποιησικὴν τῷ πατέρῳ αὐθεντίαν. Eccles. Theol. lib. 1. c. 20. πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ πάντα δ' αὐτῇ ἐγένετο. γέγεντες ἔξει, ἐνδεὶ ὄντος τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ; καὶ γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῇ, φοσὶν, ἐξ αὐτῆς τὰ πάντα γεγονόθασι, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῇ· ή δὲ ΔΙΑ πρόθισ τὸ ΤΠΗΡΕΤΙΚΟΝ σημαίνει— ἐπέρι μάν ποποικό-

τ

" the World, sometimes that all Things were
 " made *By* ($\delta\alpha$ through) Him, shews the *minis-*
 " *terial* Agency of God the Word ; for whereas
 " he might have said that all Things were made
 " [$\upsilon\pi'$ $\alpha\nu\tau\tilde{\gamma}$] by him (or of Him) as the efficient
 " Cause, he does not so express it, but thus ;
 " all Things were made *By* *Him* [as the minis-
 " terial Cause] that so he might refer us to the
 " supreme efficient Power of the Father, as the
 " Maker of the Universe." Again, " How will
 " it be consistently said, all Things were made
 " *By* *Him*, if he is the same Being with the Fa-
 " ther ? For he does not say that all Things were
 " made [$\upsilon\pi'$ $\alpha\nu\tau\tilde{\gamma}$] by *Him* [as the efficient Cause]
 " nor OF *Him* ; but that they were made [$\delta\alpha$]
 " *By* *Him*, which implies his *ministerial* Agency—
 " another Person being the *Maker*, and He *mi-*
 " *nistri*ng to him. So that we must look for ano-
 " ther Person, who is absolutely the *Maker* of the
 " Universe, even that Person who gave Subsistence
 " to all Things *By* [$\delta\alpha$] *Him* who is here still'd
 " God.—* which being so, we must of Ne-
 " cessity acknowledge, that he whom the Evan-
 " gelist styles *God*, is not the *God* supreme over
 " all ; neither the *Father*, but his only begotten
 " Son."

τΟ, αὐτὸς δὲ μακονισμένες ὥσθ' ἔπειρον Συτεῖν τὸ ποιητὴν
 δλων τὸ διὰ τὸ θεολογείν τὰ πάντα υπονοσίμενον, ibid. lib. 2.
 c. 14. The force of this Reasoning of all the learned Antient
 appears very strong to those who understand Greek and Latin :
 for it is a Solecism and Absurdity in Language to say, that all
 Things were made [$\delta\alpha$ τὸ θεῖ] By him who is *God* absolutely
 or the supreme *God*.

* Οὐ ἔτις ἔχοντων ὄμολογῶν ἀνάγκη, τὸ θεολογέμενον ἐν
 τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ μὴ τὸ δὲ πάντων εἶναι θεὸν, μηδ' αὐτὸν
 πατέει, τὸν δὲ τέττα κονογενῆ μόν. Euseb. Eccles. Theolog.
 lib. 2. c. 14.

Hence again the same *Eusebius* says, that Christ is [θεὸς] God, but not [*ὁ πρῶτος Θεός*] * the supreme God. And the primitive Council of *Antioch*, met against *Paul of Samosata*, declare it † impious to think, that the Son, who is the *Angel* of the Father, can be absolutely *the God of the Universe*; for that is to suppose the God of the Universe might be an *Angel* and sent. *Eusebius* says the same: and *Justin Martyr* frequently affirms, that the Son of God, who appear'd to the Patriarchs, &c. was not ‡ absolutely *the Maker of the Universe*; but his *Angel*, who minister'd to the *Will of the supreme Maker of the Universe*.

|| *Basil* himself, an *Athanasian*, agrees to this Doctrine. “ Let no one (says he) think that I affirm, that there are three *Supreme Agents*, — “ for there is but one *Original* of Things, who “ created them By the Son, and perfected them “ in the Spirit — you understand then there are “ three Beings, The Lord who commanded; the “ Word who created; the Holy Ghost who establish'd “ [the Things created.]

And *Cyril of Jerusalem* says, ** “ when the Father will'd that all Things shou'd be made, the Son created all Things at the Command of the

* *Dem. Evang.* p. 227.

† Τὸν μὲν θεὸν τῷ δὲ οὐλων ἀστέβεις ἄγγελον νομίσας καλεῖται,
Syn. Antioch. ὁτε γὰς τὸν ἐπίκεινα τῷ δὲ οὐλων θεὸν ψήν αὖ πε-
ντὶ πάντῃ εὐστόβεις εἰεν. *Euseb. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 1. c. 7.*

‡ Οὐ τὸ ποιητὴν τῷ δὲ οὐλων — τῇ τῷ ποιητῇ τῷ δὲ οὐλων θελήσει
ὑπηρετῶν, *Dial. p. 73. edit. Paris.*

|| Καὶ μιδέτις οὐέδω με — τρεῖς εἶναι λέγειν αρχῆς μό-
σασες — αρχὴ γῳ τῷ οὐτων μία, Δι' οὐδὲ μημαργύρεσσι, καὶ τελείωσ-
ει πνεύματι. — τελα τοίνυν νοεῖς, τὸ προσδίσσοντα κύειν, τὸ
μημαργύρεντα λόγου, τὸ σερεψύτα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγνοι, *De Spir.
Sancti. c. 16.*

** Πατρὸς βιβλιθέντος τὰ πάντα κατασκεύασται, τὸ τῷ πα-
τρὶς νεύματι ὁ οὐδὲ τὰ πάντα ἐδημιύργησεν. ἵνα τὸ μὲν νεῦμα τηρεῖ
τὸ πάτερ τὴν αὐθεντικὴν ἔξισιαν, καὶ ὁ οὐδὲ δὲ πάλιν ἔχει
τὰ τῷ ιδίῳ μημαργύρισται, *Catech. II.*

“ Father. That the Father’s *Command* might se-
“ “ cure to him his *supreme Authority*; and that the
“ Son might have Power over the Works which
“ he himself had made.”

And our own *Bisbop Bull* confesseth, + “ That
“ the Doctrine, that the Father, as *supreme Mak-*
“ *er* giving his *Commands*, created all Things by
“ his Son, executing the *Command* and *Will* of
“ the Father, is so far from being *Arian*, that
“ even those Catholic Writers who liv’d after the
“ Council of *Nice*, and also were the most ear-
“ nest Opposers of the *Arian Doctrine*, made no
“ Scruple to profess it every where in their Wri-
“ tings.”

Lastly, as to the Objection of *two Gods*, we
have already shewn the Sense of the Primitive
Church, which is, that the Father only being *un-*
originated and absolutely *supreme over all*, there is,
and can be, *no other God besides Him*. *Two Gods*,
in propriety of Speech, in the Account of Religion,
and in the Sense of the Antients, are *two unorigi-*
nated, two co-ordinate, two equal, two supreme, di-
vine Persons or Gods.

The next Text to be consider’d is *Heb. 1. v. 8,*
9, 10. In the Exposition of which *Dr. W.* (to serve
his own Hypothesis) differs entirely from the An-
tients, whom he seems not to have consider’d or
consulted at all. He alledges (*p. 490.*) against the
Plea, that the Words *God even thy God*, *v. 9.* ar-
gue *some Inferiority of God the Son*; against this
he alledges “ that the Son is consider’d as *Man*,

* *Certe a Patre tanquam summo opifice quasi imperante,*
per Filium Patris iussionem ac voluntatem exequentem, crea-
tua esse omnia, adeo Arianum non est, ut etiam Catholici Doc-
tores, qui post Concilium Nicenum vixerunt, quiq; Ariane-
haeresis acerrimi impugnatores fuere, passim illud in scriptis suis
adfirmare non sint veriti, Def. F, N. Sect. 2. c. 9. § 10.

“ and

" and in his State of Humiliation." But what say the Antients ?

*Irenæus upon the Place (Ps. 45. 6, 7.) says, **
 " The Spirit hath characteriz'd both the Persons
 " with the Title, *God* ; both the Son who is
 " anointed, and the Father who anoints him."

In Agreement with *Irenæus Origen* says, †
 " that the Prophet declares that *this God*, whose
 " Throne is for ever and ever, is anointed by
 " *God who is his God.*"

And *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, " ‡ He who is de-
 " clar'd to be *God*, is said to love Righteousness
 " and hate Iniquity, and for this Cause is *anointed*
 " &c by another *Greater God*, who is his Father."

Again, || " wherefore, He who is *the supreme*
 " *God*, and a *Greater God*, and also *thy God*,
 " hath anointed Thee, *O God* ; so that he who
 " anoints is much *Superior* to him who is anoint-
 " ed."

His second Pretense is (p. 488.) " that the
 " Words (v. 10.) *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast*
laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. are said of
 " *God the Son*, who is also *Jehovah* in the Psalm,
 " from whence these Words are taken." He adds,
 " Cou'd there be any Words thought on either
 " plainer or stronger, to express a proper *Efficiency*
 " than those are ?" And so he goes triumphantly

* Utrosq; Dei appellatione signavit Spiritus, & eum, qui unguit, Filium ; & eum qui ungit, id est, Patrem, lib. 3. c. 6.

† Καλανόει ὅπ θεῶ ὄμιλῶν ὁ περφότης, ἐν ὁ θρόνῳ τοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα τοῦ αἰώνου, &c. τοῦτον τὸν θεόν φοιτ κεχείδαι ωσθ θεός, οὐτε αὐτε θεός, cont. Cels. lib. I. p. 43.

‡ Αὐτὸς, ὁ μιλέμενος θεός εἶναι λέγεται ἡγαπηώς μικρούς καὶ μεμισηκώς αἱδικίαν, καὶ τέττα χάρειν υφ' ἐτέρας MEIZONΟΣ θεός καὶ παῖρος αὐτῆς κεχεισμένος ἐλαίω, &c. Dem. Evang. lib. 4. p. 192.

|| Διόπερ ἐπ τέττω ἔχεισθ σε, ὁ θεός, ὁ αἰωτάτω καὶ μεῖζων θεός, ὁ καὶ σὺ θεός, ὡς εἶναι καὶ τοῦ χειρομήτη τοῦ χειρούτα πολὺ πρότερον, ibid. lib. 4. c. 15.

on, as if he thought he had really prov'd something: not considering all the while, that he is only labouring to make St. Paul contradict himself, who had said just before v. 2. that *God made the Worlds* [Δικ] *By his Son* [as the ministring Cause] *whom he appointed Heir of all Things.* Is this like making the Son the supreme *Jehovah*, the supreme efficient Author of the Universe? But as Dr. W. is ready to own the Antients to be the best Expositors of Scripture, let us hear them. The Dr. wou'd have it thought the Antients understand the Words of Christ, as he does, saying in his Sermons (p. 65.) that they were so understood *in the fourth and fifth Centuries*; and *never otherwise than he knows of.* But does he know of any one Antient, in the three first Centuries, that understood the Words of Christ? not one. But others know that the Antients unanimously understood the Words of God the Father. So * *Irenæus* plainly understands them, and † *Tertullian* from this very place (with *Irenæus* and other Antients) proves the Son and Spirit to be the *Hands of God*, *By which he wrought those Things which he made.* And ‡ *Origen*, referring to the Words of the Psalm 102. 25, 27. plainly understands them of God the Father, whom, he stiles [πρῶτον θεὸν] *the supreme God*, in Distinction to the Son, whom he stiles [δεύτερον] *the second God.* || *Eusebius* likewise, in his Comment upon the Psalm, understands the Words, of God the Father. And there is no Reason at all to think that the Apostle applics the Words to the Son, and

* See lib. 4. c. 3. p. 230. edit. Massuet. & lib. 5. c. 6. where the Son and Spirit are call'd the *Hands of God the Father.*

† Hic est Dei dextra & manus ambæ, per quas operatus est ea quæ molitus est, opera enim manuum tuarum, inquit, Cels. Advers. Hermog. c. 45.

‡ Vid. Orig. cont. Cels. lib. 6. p. 318.

|| Vid. Euseb. Com. in loc. Psal.

not to the Father. To suppose them apply'd to the Son is making the Apostle use a needless Repetition, who had before, v. 2. said, that God by his Son *made the Worlds*. Secondly, they are aptly and naturally spoken of God the Father: That in them the Apostle might, by the Assertion of the *Omnipotence* and *Immutability* of God, confirm and give the highest Assurance of the Continuance of the Glory, and Dominion of Christ, to which God, his God, is represented to have exalted him, above the Angels, v. 8, 9. and which Exaltation is describ'd by his *sitting on God's right Hand*, v. 13. So that the Text and Context runs thus; *Unto the Son, he faith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom: Thou hast loved Righteousness and hated Iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows:* and [that we may not doubt of the Stability and Continuance of this Kingdom of Christ, it is given him by that supreme Lord, *Jehovah*, whose Power and Immutability the Psalmist elsewhere thus sets forth] *Thou, Lord, in the Beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, &c. They shall perish, but thou remainest — They shall be chang'd, but thou art the same.* And this Reasoning of the Apostle is very like our Saviour's own Reasoning, Joh. 10. 28, 29. Our Lord having told the Jews, that *he gave unto his Disciples eternal Life, and that they should never perish;* he immediately adds, as a reason to confirm them in the assurance of what he promis'd, *my Father which gave them me is greater than all.* They might therefore depend upon his being able to perform what he promis'd, as having the Power and Authority of the Father who is greater than all. Dr. W. has * offer'd some fri-

* *First Defense*, p. 95. *Sermons*, p. 63.

volous pretences to favour his own Exposition and Hypothesis, which the Reader may consult if he pleases: it is sufficient for me, that, with the Reason of the Thing, I have all the Antients on my Side in the Application of the Passage, now consider'd, to God the Father of Christ.

Another Text which Dr. *W.* judges to favour his notion is *John 10. 30. I and my Father are one.* As if this meant, or could mean, that the Father and Son were *the same God.* The Jews indeed drew such an invidious Inference from these words, and charg'd our Saviour with *making himself God,* v. 33. The Unreasonableness of this Charge he confuted, v. 34, 35, 36. telling them, that he had affirm'd no more than that he was *the Son of God,* tho yet in their Law mere Men were call'd Gods, without offence. And the Unity intimated in the Expression of the *Father and him being one* is plainly, as the Context leads us to understand it, an *Unity of Concord and Power, not of metaphysical Substance;* Christ declaring to the Jews that his Sheep or Disciples were secure, by being in his Hand, of the Promise of *eternal Life,* which he gave them, v. 28. because v. 29. his *Father who is greater than all* had committed them unto him, and given him Power to confer *eternal Life* upon them: so that he being invested with the Power of his Almighty Father, their being in his Hand was the same as being in his Father's Hand; for thus, by a *communication of Power* to him from the Father, which he exercis'd in Agreement with the Will of the Father, *He and his Father are one.*

The same *Unity* which was between our Saviour and his Father our Lord prays may be *in his Disciples,* saying (*John 17. 11, 21, 22.*) *Holy Father, keep thro' thine own Name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be ONE, as we are:—That they all may be ONE, as thou Father art in me, and*

In thee, that they also may be ONE in us——that they may be ONE, even as we are ONE. And thus the Antients unanimously understand it; and not one of 'em ever infer'd (except Tertullian, after he was a *Montanist*, and had left the Church) an Unity of Substance from this Passage; and Tertullian himself understood the Unity of Substance so, as that the Son was only a *small Part* [*radius ex sole*] of the immense *Substance* of the Father: and also explain'd the Words of *Unity of Love*, and *Concord*, between the Father and the Son.

" * Concerning his Sheep also (our Lord says)
" that none cou'd take them out of his Hand.
" For my Father who gave them me is greater
" than all, and I and the Father are one. One
" Thing, he says, not one Person. For one Thing,
" in the neuter Gender, does not express *Identity*,
" but *UNION*, *Likeness*, *Conjunction*, the *Love* of
" the Father towards the Son, and the *Obedience*
" of the Son to the *Will* of his Father.

And Origen, " † If any one is disturb'd at
" these Expressions, as if we favour'd the Opinion
" of those [the *Sabellians*] who deny the Father
" and the Son to be two distinct subsisting Beings,
" or Persons, let him consider that Text [*Acts*
" 4. v. 32.] All that believ'd were of one Heart
" and one Soul; and then he will understand this,

* *De oibus etiam suis, quod nemo illas de manu ejus eriperet. Pater enim quod mihi dedit, maius est omnibus;* &
Pater unum sumus—unum sumus, non unus sumus—
Unum dicit neutrali verbo; quod non pertinet ad singularitatem,
sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad conjunctionem; ad di-
lectionem Patris qui Filium diligit, & ad obsequium Filii qui vo-
luntati Patris obsequitur. Adv. Prax. c. 22.

† *ΕΙ δέ τις ἐκ τάτων πεισθείστωται, μή τη αὐτομολεῖμεν*
της τούς ανασηντας δύο εἶναι ὑποσάστας πατέρα, καὶ ψὸν ἐπιση-
τιτο τὸ, οὐ δὲ πάντων τοῦ πισευτάντων οὐ καρδία καὶ οὐ ψυχὴ μία.
τα διεργόν τὸ, Εγὼ καὶ ὁ πατέρας ἐν ἑσμέν. — Θρησκεύομεν
οὐ τὸ πατέρα τῆς αληθείας, καὶ τὸ οὐδεν τὴν αλήθειαν, οὐλα δύο τῷ
ποιεῖν πεφύματα, οὐ δὲ τῷ ομονόᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυ-
τησι τῷ βελτίωτος. Cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 386.

“ *I and my Father are one.*” To which he adds presently, “ we worship therefore the Father of “ *Truth*, and also the Son who is *the Truth*, being “ *two Things in Subsistence, but One in Agree-
ment and Consent, and Sameness of Will.*”

And *Hippolytus* in like manner *, “ If he al-
ledgeth that our Saviour hath said, *I and the
Father are one*; let him consider and he will
perceive, that he did not say, *I and the Father
AM one*; but that we ARE one: for the Ex-
pression, we ARE, does not denote one Person,
but two Persons, and one Power. And our Sa-
viour Himself hath resolv'd the Matter, saying
to his Father concerning his Disciples, *the Glory
which thou gaveſt me I have given them, that
they may be ONE, as we are ONE, &c.* [Job. 17.
v. 22.] — What have the Noetians to say to
this? are all (Christ's Disciples) one Body in
Subſtance; or are we one in Power and Unani-
mity of Mind and Purpose? In like Manner,
the Son, who was ſent, is one with the Father
in Power, and Concord.”

And *Novatian* argues, † “ If Christ was the
Father, as the Heretics imagine, he ſhould have
“ ſaid,

* Εὰν δὲ λέγεις, αὐτος ἐπεν, ἡγώ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἑσμὲν, εἰ-
τανέτω [leg. vel ἐπισάλω vel ἐπτετίνω] τὸ νῦν καὶ μαθαντι-
όν πὲ εἰπεν, ὅπερ ἡγώ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ΕΙΜΙ, ἀλλ’ ἐν ΕΣΜΕΝ
τὸ γδ̄ ΦΣΜFN ἐκ ἐφ’ ἑνὸς λέγεται, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ δύο πρόσωπα ἔσ-
τει, ΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ δὲ μίαν. αὐτὸς δὲ αὐτὸς ἀπέλυσεν, εἰπὼν ταῖ-
μαθητῶν πρὸς τὸ πατέρα, τὸν δέξαν ἦν ἔδωκας μοι, ἔδωκα δι-
λοῖς. ἵνα ὥστε ἐν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν. &c. — πί πρὸς ταῦτα
ἔχοντες λέγεται οἱ Νοντιανοί, μὴ πάντες ἐν σῶμα ἐσιν κατὰ τὴν
κοιταν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δυνάμειν καὶ τὴν διαθέσει τῆς ὁμοφρονίας ἐν γνόμεναι;
τὸ αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ὁ πᾶς ὁ παμφθεῖς — ὡμολόγουν ἀναίνει
τῷ πατεὶ δυνάμει, διαθέσει [leg. καὶ διαθέσει] Com. Nov. § 7.
edit. Fabric.

† Si enim erat, ut hæretici putant, Pater Christus, oportuit
dicere, ego Pater unus sum. At cum ego dicit, deinde Patrem
infert, dicendo, ego & Pater, proprietatem personæ suæ, id est,

" said, *I the Father am one [one Person] but in saying I, then adding the Father, and saying, I and the Father, he separates and distinguisheth his own proper Person, as being the Son, from the Authority of the Person of the Father ; not only in the mere Sound of Name, but also in the Order and Disposition of Power."*

Lastly, Alexander Bishop of Alexandria agrees to the same Sense of the Text, and observes, " that our Lord in the * Words, *I and the Father are one*, did not stile Himself the Father ; or signify that their two Natures in Subsistence were one : but that the Son was the exact Resemblance of the Father, and the perfect Likeness of Him by Nature."

From the precedent Sense of the Antients upon the Text Job. 10. 30. it appears, that as the Text was urg'd by the Sabellians, in Favour of their Notion of an Unity of Substance in the Father and the Son ; so that Sense of it was constantly deny'd by the Catholics, as confounding the divine Persons : whence it follows, that the antient Church thought an Unity of Substance was capable of no other but a Sabellian Sense, which was opposite to the Catholic Doctrine, that the Father and the Son were, as Alexander expresses it, [τῇ ὑποστασὶ δύο φύσεις] two Natures distinct in Subsistence, or two distinct subsisting Beings or Agents.

Another Text, which Dr. W. thinks to establish his Notion by, is Rom. 9. v. 5 — Of whom, as

Filiī, a paterna auctoritate discernit atq. distinguit, non tantum modo de sono NOMINIS, sed etiam de ordine dispositiæ Potestatis. Novat. c. 27. edit. Jackson.

† "Οπερ φησιν ὁ κινεός & πατέρες οὖν ἀναγορεύων, ἃδε τοῖς τῇ ὑποστάσει Δύο ΦΥΣΕΙΣ μίαν εἶναι συμβιβών· αλλ' ὅπ τὴν πατεῖκην ἐμφέρειν αἰκειβῶς πέφυκε σοζεῖν ὁ γὸς τῷ πατέρος, τὴν γὰρ πάντα ὄμοιότητα αὐτῷ ἐκ φύσεως αἰτομαζάμενΘ., Epist. apud Theodore. lib. I. c. 4.

concerning

concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.

This Text the Tritheistic-Orthodox on one Hand, and the Sabellian-Orthodox on the other Hand, are apt to triumph in, making no Question at all but that the Words, *who is over all God blessed for ever*, are undoubtedly ascrib'd to Christ, and that hence he is prov'd according to the one, to be *the same God with the Father*, in the Gnostic, Sabellian Sense ; or according to the other, by a directly contrary Interpretation, to be distinctly from the Father *God supreme over all*, in the Tri-theistic Sense. And thus our Saviour is in the Text, as it were, again crucify'd between two Thieves, two Heresies equally destructive of his true Divinity. And it is not consider'd in either of them, that if the Words were really spoken of Christ, St. Paul himself has enter'd a *Caveat* against both the Senses, saying, *1 Cor. 15. 27, 28. For he (God the Father, v. 24.) hath put all Things under his (Christ's) Feet ; but when he saith, all Things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, who did put all Things under Him—and the Son himself shall be subject unto him, that did put all Things under him.*

Before I shew the Sense of the Antients upon the preceding Text, I will make a few Observations upon it.

1st. In the Text the Word (*θεὸς*) *God* is wanting in several Antient Latin MSS. of Cyprian, and it is doubtful whether Cyprian read it in his Copy or not. The Reason which Dr. Mills gives, that Cyprian must have had it, viz. because he follows the same Translation of the Scriptures which Tertullian follow'd, who had it in his Copy, is not a good one ; because any one upon comparing the Citations of Tertullian and Cyprian together, as I have carefully done, will have reason to conclude,

they

they did not follow the same Translation. *Grotius* observes, that the Word was not in the *Syriac Version*. *Mills* finds Faults with *Grotius* as being incorrect in this Observation, and thinks it was in the *Syriac Version*. But *Mills* wou'd have had Reason to have judg'd otherwise, had he read *Ephraem the Syrian Writer*, who twice cites the Text, and in both Places omits the * Word ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma$) God. Dr. *Mills* also (who was a very indiligent Reader of the Fathers) pretends, that *Irenæus* both read the Word ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma$) God in the Text, and withal alledg'd it in Proof of the Divinity of Christ; which is a gross Mistake. For tho' the Word is indeed inserted in the Text in *Irenæus*, yet it seems plainly an Interpolation, because *Irenæus* neither explains at all the Words, *who is over all God Blessed*, nor infers from them that Christ is *God*: but cites, what he did cite, only to prove that † *Jesus Christ was one and the same Person*, which he proves from the Words, *of whom according to the Flesh Christ came*; and the Words following being nothing at all to *Irenæus's Argument*, but rather seeming to weaken it, it is not, I think, probable that he here cited them, and 'tis certain he no where useth them to prove the Divinity of Christ, as *Mills* pretends. The Text, with the Word ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma$) God in it, is also cited by the Antient Council of *Antioch* in their Synodic Epistle, and they cite it to prove the *Divinity of Christ*; but not to prove his *supreme Divinity*, or that he is *over all God Blessed*: this they deny in this very Epistle. But they alledge only in Proof of it the Words, *who is over all*, either having not in their Copy the Word ($\Theta\epsilon\delta\sigma$) *God*, tho' it is now read

* P. 43, 136. edit. Gr. Oxon.

† *UNUM & eundem esse Jesum Christum. lib. 3. c. 16. edit. Iaffues.*

there; or applying it to God the Father, whom alone they stile absolutely (*ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ὅλων*) the God of the Universe.

Origen is another whom Dr. Mills refers to, as having the Word (*Θεὸς*, God, in his Comment upon the Text; but he unfairly puts upon us his Interpreter and Interpolator *Ruffinus*, instead of Origen Himself.

2dly. Admitting the Word (*Θεὸς*) God to have been originally in the Text, the Question will be, what is the true meaning of it: for the Words are of ambiguous Construction. They may either signify, *of whom Christ came*: God who is over all be blessed for ever; or, *of whom Christ came*, who is over all: God be blessed for ever; or, *of whom Christ came*, who is over all God blessed for ever. That which favours the last Interpretation of the Words is, that in the stile of Scripture, where it is said, *God be blessed*, or *blessed be God*, the order of the Greek is different viz. [*ἐυλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς*] *blessed be God*. And this Observation is true, both with Respect to the stile of the Septuagint, and of the New Testament: but then in Favour of the first and second Construction of the Words, it is to be taken Notice of, that neither St. Paul or any of the Apostles or Evangelists do any where else in Scripture, ascribe unto Christ the Expression, *God over all*, or the *blessed God*; on the contrary, these Titles are peculiarly attributed to God the Father, even in Contradistinction to * Christ. And he is emphatically stild *the Blessed*, Mar. 14. 61. Rom. 1. 25. 2 Cor. 11. 31. In which last place the Words [*δὲ ὁ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὸς αἰώνας*] *who is blessed for evermore*, and which are spoken of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, are parallel to those in the Text before us. So that the

* See *Luc.* 1. 68. 2 *Cor.* 1. 3. *Ephes.* 1. 3, 4, 6. 1 *Pet.* 1. 3
Word

Words may well be understood as a Doxology to God the Father, for sending Christ in our Flesh to redeem us.

zly. With respect to the Sense of the Antients relating to this Text, it does not appear certain that any of them besides *Tertullian*, when a *Montanist*, and *Cyprian* and *Novatian* (probably from *Tertullian*) did apply the Words to Christ. Yet none of these, as might have been expected, ever infer'd from them, that Christ was *God supreme over all*; they knowing that *all Things were deliver'd unto Him from his Father*, Matt. 11. 27. and that *when all Things were put under him, he is excepted who did put all Things under Him*, 1 Cor. 15. 27.

Clemens Romanus, an Apostolical Writer, intimates that he did not understand the Words, *who is over all, God blessed for ever*, to be spoken of Christ. For in refering to the Text he says, that from *Jacob* came * *the Lord Jesus according to the Flesh*, adding no more; nor ever anywhere in his Epistle, stiling Christ so much as barely *God at all*, tho' here he had an opportunity of doing it scarce to be miss'd, had he thought the latter Part of the Verse (*Rom. 9. 5.*) was meant of Christ: and from his not applying the Words to Christ it is reasonable to conclude, that he thought they were by the Apostle understood of *God the Father only*, whom in this Section he stiles [*ο παντοπάτως θεός*] *the God supreme over all*. Hence also the Reason appears why *Clemens* never calls Christ *God*; viz. because St. John's Gospel being not written when he wrote this Epistle, and not understanding the Word *God* in the Text of St. Paul to be af-

* Ἐξ αὐτῆς οὐκέτι Ινοῦς τὸ γαπὰ οὐρανό. Epist. ad Corinth. Sect. 32. edit. Wot. & Cos.

crib'd to Christ, he did not find that Christ was call'd God in any Part of Scripture known to him, or then written. And to this Purpose it is farther observable, that when he seems to allude (*Sect. 36.*) to some Parts of the first Chapter of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, as verse, 3, 4, 5, 7, yet he takes no Notice of Christ's being stil'd *God*, v. 8. tho' he is speaking the highest Things which could be said of him. This looks as if he did not really know any Thing of this Epistle, but only as having convers'd with and been taught by St. *Paul*, he might remember and use several Expressions which are found in this Epistle.

* *Hippolytus*, in whose Book against *Noetus* the Text is found, and applied to Christ, gives it for the Reason of his being *God over all*, that *all Things were deliver'd unto Him from his Father*: and so he was [πάντοπάτωρ] Almighty; but then he says he was *constituted Almighty* by the Father: which shews that he did not think Christ *supreme God over all*, or equally *Almighty* with the Father. But it must be own'd that this Work of *Hippolytus* is very much interpolated; and so 'tis hard to know what he really wrote.

Therefore as far as it appears, it was the undoubted Sense of the Antient Church, that the Title [ο ἐπὶ πάντων, or ο ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεός] *God over all*, so peculiarly belong'd to the *Father*, that it was accounted *Heresy*, *Blasphemy*, and *Impiety* to ascribe it unto Christ. Whence, I think, it plainly follows, that they who taught this as the *Doctrine* of the Church must understand the Words, *who is over*

* Οὐλος ο ὁν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός ἐστι. λέγει γε πάντα μη παρεχθέσθαι υπὸ τῆς παῖρος. Cons. *Noet.* § 6. edit. *Fabric.* Παρεχθέσθαι παρὰ παῖρος κατεσάθη. *ibid.*

all God blessed for ever, of the Father; and there being no Text besides this, wherein God or the Father is stil'd (οὐκ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς) *God over all*, that Doctrine was probably deduc'd from this Text amongst others.

A very Antient and Excellent Book, entitled the *Apostolic Constitutions*, informs us, that some of the Simonian Gnostic Heretics * taught, that Jesus was *the God over all*, thinking him to be *his Father*. In opposition to which Heresy the Church taught † “that the *Father is God over all*; Christ is God “the only begotten;—the Holy Ghost is the “*Comforter by Christ*.”

Ignatius, a Writer of the apostolic Age, the larger Epistles ascribed to whom have been prov'd to be genuine beyond all reasonable Exception, makes the Assertion that Christ is *God over all to be the Doctrine of the Devil*, whom, on this Account, he thus accosts; ‡ “Why dost thou not think “that Christ was born of a Virgin, but that he “is the *God over all*, He who *absolutely is*, su-“preme over all? Say then, who is it that sent “him? Who is he that bears rule over him? And “whose *Will* is it that he obeys?”

Again, || “wherefore that he is not *the God over all*, even the *Father*, but his *Son*, he him-

O 2

“ self

* Ἐλέγει δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸ Ιησοῦν τὸ δῆμον πάντων
τὸν καπτίουσσιν, αὐτὸν ἔκυρτο πατέρα μονογενῆς, &c. Const.
Apost. lib. 6. c. 26. edit. Cor. a Cler.

† Παῖς δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς· Χειρὸς δὲ μονογενῆς θεὸς·—
τίνα μάκρον δὲ παρόκλιθ, τὸν ταῦτα Χειρὸς παρπόμενον, ibid.
lib. 3. c. 17.

‡ Πῶς δὲ παῖς γὰρ ἐπι σοι δοκεῖ ὁ Χειρὸς εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ παρ-
έντος, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς, οὐκ ὁ παντοκράτωρ; τίς δὲ ὁ
τοῦν ἀποστέλλεις, εἰπέ; τίς ὁ τέλειος χωρέων; γνωμή δὲ πνΩ-
Θοῦ ἐπειθάρχησε; Ignat. Epist. ad Philip. § 7.

|| Οπότε αὐτῷ ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς καὶ παῖς, αλλὰ μόδις
καὶ λέγεται αὐτοβαίνων πρὸς τούτον με καὶ πατέρα υἱοῦν,

“ self faith, I ascend unto my Father and your Fa-
 “ ther, and unto my God and your God: and when
 “ all Things are put under him, then shall be be sub-
 “ ject unto him who put all Things under him, that
 “ God may be all in all: wherefore he who put all
 “ Things under him, and is all in all, is one person,
 “ and he whom they are put under, and who also
 “ himself with all Things will be made subject,
 “ is another Person.”

And Origen says * “ admit there are some, a-
 “ mongst a Multitude of Believers of different
 “ Opinions, who rashly affirm, that our Saviour
 “ is the God over all; yet we do not affirm this, as
 “ believing him who hath said, My Father is
 “ greater than I.”

And Irenæus before him every where supposes
 the God over all to be the Person of the Father.
 “ By him [of or from him] who is the God over all,
 “ all things were appointed and made by [per
 “ thro'] his Word, [as the ministering Cause].”

Ἐγενόν μικρὸν καὶ θεὸν υἱοῦν· καὶ, ὅταν ἴστολαγῆς αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τὰ
 καὶ αὐτὸς υπολαγήστας τῷ ἴστολῷ ξανθεῖ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα· οὐ γάρ
 θεὸς τὸ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν· ἀλλὰν ἐπεργός ἐστιν ὁ ἴστολός καὶ ὁ πάντα
 πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἐπεργός ὁ υπελάγης, ὃς καὶ μετὰ πάντων ἴστολος εἰσελθεῖ. Epist. ad Tarsens. §. 5. and a little before he said, in
 the Doctrine of the Ministers of Satan, ὃν αὐτὸς (ὗτος) ἐστιν
 ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς, that the Son is God over all. ibid. § 2.

* Εἴσω δὲ τινὰς ὡς ἐν πλείσταις πιστεύοντων καὶ δεχούντων εἰς
 οὐνιαν διὰ τὴν προφέτειαν ἴστολοθεὸν· Φασὶ δὲ οὖν τὸν
 πάντα θεὸν ἀλλὰ ἔπειτα οὐκ ἡμεῖς τοις ιον, οἱ πατέρωμενοι αὐτῷ λέγοι
 ὁ πάντας με μετέων μικρὸν εἰσι. Adv. Cel. lib. 8. p. 387.

† Ab eo, qui super omnes est Deus, &c constituta sunt & facta
 per verbum ejus, &c. lib. 3. c. 8. edit. Massuet. Pater enim
 conditionem simul & verbum suum portans, & verbum por-
 sum a Patre præstat Spiritum omnibus, quemadmodum vult
 Pater. ————— & sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super
 omnia, & per omnia, & in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pa-
 ter, & ipse est Caput Christi; per omnia autem Verbum, &
 ipse est caput Ecclesie; in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, &c.
 lib. 3. c. 18.

Again, he hath these remarkable Words, “ The Father upholding the *Creation* and his *Word*, and the *Word* being upheld by the Father, gives the *Spirit* to all, as the Father wills.—And thus it is manifest there is but one God even the Father, who is above all, and thro’ all, and in all: The Father is above all, who is also the *Head of Christ*; his *Word* is thro’ all, who is also the *Head of the Church*; and his *Spirit* is in us all, &c.”

Eusebius of Cæsarea teaches the same Doctrine, * “ as Christ (says he) was not a sensible Light, so neither was he himself the God who is over all.”

Again, + “ the Evangelist does not say, that the Word was God absolutely with the Article; lest thereby he should be affirm’d to be the God over all.”

Again, ‡ “ no one can piously affirm that the Son is the God over all.”

Again, || “ If, as Marcellus imagines, he who is absolutely God, and the *Word* which is in him, be one and the same Being; it follows that he who was begotten in the Holy Virgin, and was made Flesh, and became Man, and suffer’d what is written of him, and died for our Sins, the same was the God over all, which Sabellius having dar’d

* Ως δὲ ἐκ διδοῦντος ἐπύγχανε φῶς, πως εἰδεὶ τὸ ἐπίκεινα τῶν ὅλων αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἦν. Eccles. Theolog. lib. 1. c. 20.

† Οὐκ εἰπών, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν ὁ θεὸς μεῖծα τῆς τῷ ἀρχέτυπῳ περιβολῆς. οὐαὶ μὴ αὐτὸν εἴναι τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων [θεὸν] οἰστοιτε. ibid. lib. 2. c. 14.

‡ Οὐτε γὰρ τὸν ἐπίκεινα τῷ ὅλων θεὸν μίσον ἀντιτίθεται εἰπών ἐντεβής. ibid. lib. 1. c. 7.

|| ΕΙ δὲ ἐν ΤΑΥΤΟΝ ἦν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ λόγος, ὃς δοκεῖ Μαρκελλω, ὃ ἐν ἀγίᾳ παρθένῳ γεννῶμεν Θεοῦ καὶ συρκαθεῖς καὶ ἐνανθρωπίσας καὶ παθὼν τὰ ἀναγγελμάτων καὶ ἀποθανὼν ψυχὴ τῷ ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς, ὃ δὴ πολιτόσαντα φάναι τὸν Σαβελλιον οὐ ἐκκλισία τῷ θεῷ ἐν αἵρεσι καὶ βλασφήμοις ἐγκατέλεξεν. ibid. lib. 2. c. 4.

" to affirm, was esteem'd by the Church of God
 " to be an *Atheist* and *Blasphemer.*"

Lastly, * " The Evangelist (says he) cou'd have
 " stil'd the Word [δος] *God absolutely*, had he
 " thought the Father and Son to have been *one*
 " and *the same Being*; and that the Word was *the*
 " *God over all.*—But now by stiling the *Father*
 " [δος] *God absolutely*, and the *Word* barely (θεος)
 " *God*, or a *divine Person*, he has plainly taught us
 " to esteem the *Father of the Word*, with whom
 " the *Word* was, to be *the supreme God over all*;
 " and next after him to understand that the *Word*,
 " who is his only-begotten *Son*, is not *the God over*
 " *all*, but that he is a *divine Person.*"

From the foregoing Testimonies it is evident, that it was the Doctrine of the primitive Church, that the Title of *God over all* was so peculiarly ascrib'd to God the Father in the Scriptures, that it was *Blasphemy* and *Impiety* to ascribe it to the Son of God: whence I conclude that the Words of the Text, *Rom. 9. 5. who is over all God blessed for ever*, were by the antient Church generally understood and interpreted, as spoken of *God the Father*. And *Tertullian*, † *Cyprian*, and *Novatian*, who attributed

* Δυνάμεν Θ γάν εἰπεῖν, καὶ ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ὁ λόγος μετὰ τῆς ἀρθρίς περισθίκης, εἴ γε ἐν καὶ πάντοι ἥγειτο τὸ πατέρες εἶναι καὶ τὸν, αὐτόν τε εἶναι τὸ λόγον τὸ δὲ πάντων θεὸν—νυνὶ δὲ περιπάν, καὶ ὁ λόγος οὐ περὶ τὸν θεόν—καὶ θεὸς οὐκ ὁ λόγος, μονονυχὸς σαφέσερον ἡμᾶς διδάσκων, πρῶτον μὲν ἥγειται θεὸς τὸν ἐπικεντα τῷ ὄλων, αὖτὶ τὸν τῷ λόγῳ πατέρες, περὶ δὲ οὐκ ὁ λόγος. ἐπειτα μηδὲ αὐτὸν, μηδὲ γυναικῶν οὐ καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτὸς οὐκονοεντος οὐδὲ, ἐχὲ αὐτὸς οὐκ ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς, αλλ' ὅπ καὶ αὐτὸς θεὸς οὐ. *Eccles. Theolog. lib. 2. c. 17.*

† The one supreme God all thro' *Cyprian's Writings* is the Person of the Father, who he says " is the *one God who is Lord of all, of unequall'd Majesty and Power.*" Unus igitur omnium Dominus est Deus; neq; enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortem, cum sola omnem teneat potestatem. *De bono patientia*, p. 14. *Tertullian's and Novatian's Opinion* have been shewn

tributed this Text to our Saviour, nevertheless still confess'd that the Father only was *the God supreme, or over all.* Nay *Basil* Himself, an *Athanaian*, shews, that the Title of *God over all* peculiarly belongs to God the Father, saying ; * “ It is the “ peculiar *Characteristic* of his Person who is *God over all* to be the *Father*, and to have no Cause “ of his Existence.”

Having shewn that the Texts of Scripture, which Dr. *W.* principally urgeth in Favour of his own Notion, are full and clearly against it ; and were understood and interpreted by the antient Church, in a Sense quite contrary to it ; I proceed to shew the Sense of the primitive Church upon some other Texts, which teach a Doctrine directly opposite to his Hypothesis.

Mat. 19. v. 17. Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God. This Text was understood by all the † Antients as spoken of God the Father, the *Original, supreme, underiv'd Good*; the Son being the *Image*, as of the *Person*, so of the *Goodness* of God the Father.

¶ *Irenæus* cites the Text as if it had been written, *why callest thou me Good, there is but one Per-*

shewn above, and will be farther shewn hereafter. *Cyprian* elsewhere to the same Purpose says, that Christ call'd the Father his Lord and God, &c. *Dominum & Deum suum* ; — quando ipsam potestatem, quā baptizamur, & sanctificationem ab eodem Patre Christus acceperit ; quem majorem dixerit, a quoclarificari petierit ; cuius voluntatem, usq; ad obsequium bibendi calicis & subeundæ mortis, impleverit. *Epist. ad Iubaian.* p. 203.

* ‘Ο δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ἔξαίρετόν τι γνῶσιμα τὸν εαυτὸν ποντίων τὸ πατήρ εἶναι, ἐκ μηδεπατὸς αἵτις υποσῆναι μόνον. *Bas. Epist. 43.* concerning the Difference of the Words, *πάτερ* and *πατήρ*.

† *Iust. Mart.* Εἰς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ μις ὁ ἐν τοῖς ἡγενοῖς. There is one who is good, even my Father who is in Heaven, *Dial. cum Tryph.*

¶ *Eis ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς, ὁ πατήρ ἐν τοῖς ἡγενοῖς.* lib. i. c. 20. edit. *Massuet.* Quem solum merito bonum pronuntiat Dominus : cuius bonitatis totus testis est mundus, *Novatian.* c. 4.

Son who is good, my Father which is in Heaven.
And so * Clemens Alexandrinus cites it. Clemens elsewhere explains his sense of the Text saying,
“ whom our Saviour and God declares to be alone
“ Good, even God the Father.” Again, “ that He
“ who is truly alone the one God supreme over all,
“ may be declar’d also to be Good for ever and
“ ever, saving us by his Son.”

+ Origen remarkably says, “ our Saviour says,
“ the Father that sent me is Greater than I ; and
“ therefore refus’d to accept the Title of Good,
“ in the proper, true, and perfect Sense of it, when
“ offer’d to him, but refer’d it gratefully to the
“ Father, and rebuk’d him who wou’d have thus
“ glorify’d the Son above Measure.” The Reason which he adds is, that the Son is not in any Thing
comparable to the Father ; “ for that he is [not the

* Pedagog. lib. 1. “Ον μόνον ὄντα θεὸν πατέρα αὐτὸν χαρακτηρίζει ὁ σωτῆρ ἡμῶν καὶ θεός. Ibid. Strom. 7. ὅπως — ὁ τῷ ὄντι μόνος εἰς παντοχώρῳ αὐτὸς ἀναφεινῆται θεὸς ἐξ αἰώνθεος εἰς αἰώνα σάλιον διὰ νύκτος. Strom. 7. p. 835. edit. Oxon.

+ Πειθομένοι τῷ σωτῆρι λέγοντι ὁ παῖς ὁ πέμψας με μετέμψησται, καὶ διὰ τοῦ μὴ ἔνεγκοντο μηδὲ τὸν, ΑΓΑΘΟΣ, περιγραφίαν τὴν κωείαν καὶ αἱρηθῆ καὶ τελείαν παραδέξασθαι αὐτῷ περιφερεμένην, αλλὰ αἰναφέρουντα αὐτὸν ἐνχαιρεῖσας τῷ πατέρι [ita plane legendum, non ut in edit. πνέυματι, quæ corruptio fiebat ex errore librarii scribentis πν., i. e. πνέυματι pro πν. i. e. πατέρι, quod non videbat Clariss. Huetius] μετ' ἐπιπλήσσεως περὸς τὸν βελόμενον ὑπερβολὴν γένονταν οὐδὲ τὸν οὐδὲν. — ἐς συγκείνεται καὶ ἡδὲν τῷ πατέρι εἰκὼν γένεται ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτότητος αὐτῷ. Com. in Joh. p. 218. Χεὶς εἰδίνεις ὅτι ἐνταῦθα μὲν κυρίως τὸ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τετακτημένον — καὶ μὴ ἐφ' ἐπέρει πνοιο. — καὶ παντὸς δὲ τῷ ὑποδέσμῳ ὃς ἐφαρμόζεται ἦν, αὐτὸν, φανῇ, ἀλλο σημανόμενον ἔχει τὸ ἐπιαυτὸν λέγομενον. εἴπερ ὡς μὲν περὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰκὼν ἐστιν αὐτότητος, ὡς δὲ περὸς τὰ λοιπά, ὅπερ ἢ τῷ πατέρῳ αὐτότητος περὶ αὐτὸν. ἢ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐστι πνα ἀναλογίαν περισσῷ ἴδειν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν τοτέ τῷ θεῷ περὸς τὸν σωτῆρα ὄντα εἰκόνα τῆς αὐτότητος αὐτῷ, ἢ περὶ ἐπὶ τῷ σωτῆρι περὸς αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπον — πλέον γάρ ἢ ὑπεροχῇ περὸς τὰ ὑποδέσμενα αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ σωτῆρι καθόλιστον εἰκὼν τῆς αὐτότητος αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ, ἢ περὶ ὑπεροχῇ τῷ θεῷ ὄντος αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα σωτῆρα ὁ πατέρις ὁ πέμψας με μετέμψησται. Com. in Mat. p. 376, 377.

"Original Good but] the *Image* of the Father's
"Goodness."

Again, "the Appellation of *Good*, properly so
"called, is in the Text attributed to him only
"who is absolutely God:"—and to no other
"Person besides—and when apply'd to an in-
"ferior Person, it hath another Signification—
"that our Saviour is the *Image* of the Father's
"Goodness; and that his Goodness is the same, or
"greater, in proportion to the Goodness of others,
"than the Goodness of the Father is to his Good-
"ness."

* Eusebius agrees to Origen's Sense, that the Son, tho good, is not the *original supreme Good*; but the *Image* of the Father's *Goodness*, who only is the *original, absolute, underiv'd Good*. So that the Sense of the antient Church plainly is, that as the Father only, who is unoriginated, is the *one God supreme over all*, so he is alone supreme and absolutely perfect in respect of every divine Attribute: and that all the Perfections of the Son, and amongst these his *Goodness*, being deriv'd to him with his Nature from the Father, are not co-ordinate or equal to the underiv'd Perfections of the Father, and so, that the Attribute of *Goodness* cannot belong to the Son in the same high and absolute Sense, in which it is ascrib'd to the Father, to whose supreme Goodness, our Saviour himself in the Text before us yields the *Pre-eminence*. And as our Saviour declar'd, that the Attribute of *Goodness* so peculiarly and eminently belong'd to his Father, that it cou'd not be ascrib'd to himself in the same high Sense and Degree of Perfection: so he has also declar'd, that the Perfection of absolute

* Καν εξετάσως τε νίς μαθήσῃ ὅπος ἐσὶ καὶ αὐτὸς αἰσ-
θεῖ επέτερος—εἰκὼν αἰαθόπτης αὐτοῦ (πατέρος) Com. in
Gal. 72.

Knowledge is the peculiar Attribute of the Father only. “ But of that Day and Hour knoweth no one [ḡdeis no Person] no not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father ONLY, Mat. 24. 36. But of that Day and that Hour knoweth no one [ḡdeis no Person] no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father, Mar. 13. v. 32.” Than which no Words or Language can more plainly and strongly express, that our Lord and Saviour did not then know the Day of Judgment spoken of in these Texts ; that being one of those Things which, as Christ told his Disciples after his Resurrection, “ the Father had put in his own Power,” *Acts* 1. 7. And which was reserv’d to be reveal’d to Him after his Exaltation to the Throne of God in Heaven. The Book of the *Revelation* is therefore call’d, *the Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, Ch. 1. v. 1.* And the Knowledge of the future State of the Church which had been in Part, and more obscurely, reveal’d to the Prophet *Daniel*, was more fully and clearly reveal’d to Christ, as the Reward of his Sufferings and Redemption of us. *Rev. 5. v. 1—9.* Dr. *W.* has nothing to alledge against the plain meaning of the precedent Texts, but the absurd *Cerinthian* distinction between the * *humane* and *divine Person* (which he unphilosophically calls the humane and divine Nature) of Christ : as if Christ knew any Thing which his entire Person knew not ; or his *Nature*, distinct from his Person, cou’d be said to know any Thing at all. The Scripture has prevented all such Quibbles (which tend only to make the Doctrines of Christ ridiculous) by expressly declaring, that the *Son* did not know the Day of Judgment, and that the *Father*

* See a Reply to Dr. *Waterland’s Defense of some Queries, by a Clergyman in the Country, Qu. 7. p. 236, &c.*

only knew it. So that there is no possible Way for Dr. W. to infer that the *Son* knew it, but by supposing him to be the *Person* of the *Father*, or the same individual intelligent Agent with the *Father*; and to differ from the *Father*, not in *Person*, but merely in *Name*.

That the Antients understood the *Son* in the Text to be Christ in his highest Capacity, to be not merely the *Son of Man*, but the very *Son of God Himself*, I shall prove from two unquestionable Writers, *Irenæus* and *Origen*, who deliver the Doctrine of the Church.

“ * Being unreasonably puffed up (says *Irenæus* to the *Gnostics*) ye presumptuously take upon you to say, that you know the unutterable Mysteries of God ; when even our *Lord, the Son of God Himself, confess'd*, that the *Father alone* knew the Day and Hour of Judgment ; expressly affirming, of that Day and Hour knoweth no one, neither the Son, but the *Father only*. If therefore the Son was not ashamed to refer the Knowledge of that Day to the Father, but said what was true ; then surely neither shou'd we be ashamed to reserve to God such Questions as are far above us : for no one is above his Master.”

Upon the preceding Words of *Irenæus* + *Erasmus* owns, that *Irenæus* seem'd to think that the *Father only* knew the Day of Judgment, and that

* Irrationabiliter autem inflati audaciter inenarrabilia Dei mysteria scire vos dicitis : quandoquidem & Dominus, ipse Filius Dei, ipsum judicii diem & horam concessit scire solum Patrem; manifeste dicens, de die autem illa & hora nemo scit, neq; Filius, nisi Pater solus. Si igitur scientiam diei illius Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est ; neq; nos erubescamus, quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos, reservare Deo ; nemo enim super magistrum est. *Iren.* lib. 2. c. 28. edit. *Massuet.*

† Videatur sentire quod solus Deus sciverit diem & horam, ignorante Filio. *Proleg.* in *Iren.* p. 17.

the Son did not know it : and our Learned Bishop Bull * agrees with Erasmus, that the Words seem to ascribe Ignorance to the Son of God, even in his highest Capacity of being the Son of God. Irenæus, to put his Sense out of all Question, presently adds, “ † If any one enquires into the Reason, why the Father, who communicates in all Things to the Son, is yet by our Lord expressly declar'd to know ALONE that Day and Hour ; he will not at present find any fitter or more decent, or indeed any other safe Answer but this, that since our Lord is the only Teacher of Truth, we may learn from him, *that the Father is above all* ; for the Father, saith he, is Greater than I. The Father therefore is here declar'd by our Lord himself to be SUPERIOR in KNOWLEDGE also ; to the End that while we are in this World, we may learn to acknowledge God only to have perfect Knowledge, and leave such Questions to Him.” Dr. W. to shew how low he can descend in Reason and Argument, observes upon the Words of Irenæus, ‡ “ the Father (says he) communicates in all Things with the Son : and Consequently in all Knowledge, and particularly in that of the Day of Judgment.”

* Fateor verba primo intuitu videri Filio Dei, etiam qui maxime proprie Dei Filius est, ignorantiam tribuere. Def. Fid. Nit. p. 82.

† Si quis exquirat causam, propter quam in omnibus Pater communicans Filio, solus scire horam & diem a Domino manifestatus est ; neq; aptabilem magis neq; decentiorem, nec sine periculo alteram quam hanc inveniet in praesenti (quoniam enim solus verax magister est Dominus) ut discamus per ipsum, *super omnia esse Patrem* : Etenim Pater, ait, *major me est*. Et secundum agnitionem itaq; præpositus esse Pater annunciatus est a Domino nostro ad hoc, ut & nos, in quantum in figura hujus mundi sumus, perfectam scientiam & tales quæstiones concedamus Deo. lib. 2. c. 28.

‡ First Defense, p. 105. 1st edit.

the Thing particularly excepted in this very Sentence. Antient Writers may be made to say any Thing at this rate of explaining them. Cou'd he alledge that *Irenæus*, or any other Antient, ever taught, that Christ knew what in the Text, and by *Irenæus* upon it, is declar'd to be known by the Father only ; or that the Son was Equal in Knowledge to God the Father, it wou'd have been saying something.

2. *Origen*, tho' he allows that the Son knows the whole Will of God, yet denies that he is equally perfect in Knowledge with the Father. “ * The inquisitive Reader (says he) may ask, “ whether the Father knows himself, as he is “ known by the Son : and finding that it is writ- “ ten, *the Father who sent me is greater than I*, he “ will be perswaded that this is in all respects true, “ so as to say that the Father is greater than the “ Son even in Knowledge also, being more per- “ fectly and clearly known by Himself, than by “ the Son.” Agreeably to this he elsewhere says upon the Words of the Apostle, *this is the true Light*, “ + for the same Reason as God, the “ Father of him who is *the Truth*, is a **SUPERIOR** “ and **GREATER** Truth ; and the Father of him “ who is *Wisdom*, is **GREATER** and more excel-

* Curiosus lector inquirat, utrum a semetipso cognoscatur Pater, quomodo cognoscitur a Filio : sciensq; illud quod scriptum est, *Pater qui misit me major me est* ; in omnibus verum esse contendet, ut dicat & in COGNITIONE Filio Patrem esse MAJOREM, dum perfectius & purius a semetipso cognoscitur quam a Filio. lib. 4. de principiis apud Hieronym. in Epist. ad Azit. c. 4. atq; id esse causæ, quare Filium a Patre comprehendi, Patrem vero a Filio neutiquam comprehendendi posse opinatus sit, ait Hieron. ibid.

+ Ω δὲ λόγω ὁ πατὴρ τὸν αἰλιθεῖας θεὸς πλείων ἐστὶ καὶ μείζων αἰλιθεῖα, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ τὸν σοφίας κρείττων ἐστὶ καὶ διαφέρων τὴν σοφίαν, τὸτε ὑπερέχει τῷ εἶναι φῶς αἰλιθινόν. Com. in Job. p. 70.

“ lent

" less than *Wisdom*; for the same Reason he ex.
" cells him also who is the *true Light*."

Basil himself understands the Text of the divine Person of Christ, and that the *Knowledge* spoken of in it belongs *primarily* to God the Father. His Words are very remarkable.

" * That which I have been taught from a Child,
" of those that went before me, is this—that as
" we understand those Words, *there is none good*
" *but one, that is God*, to be spoken by the Son,
" not as excluding himself from being Partaker
" of the Nature of Good, but only as supposing
" the Father to be the FIRST Good, and by the
" Word *none* meaning no other FIRST Good;
" but that he himself is the Second—So in those
" Words, *no one knoweth, &c.* we believe our
" Lord meant to ascribe to the Father the FIRST
" KNOWLEDGE of Things present and future,
" and to declare to the World, that he is in all
" Things the FIRST CAUSE, &c."

And it is certain, as hath been shewn before, that the moderate *Athanasian* Writers never taught, that the Son was *equal* to the Father in *absolute divine Perfections*; but profess'd, that the Father, as being alone *unoriginated*, and the *first Cause*, was in all Things *supereminent* to the Son, who deriv'd his Nature and all his Perfections from him; and who always acted in Obedience to his supreme Authority.

* "Α πίνυν ἐκ παιδὸς τῷδε οὐ πατέρων μάκοντεν, — πῦντ
ἐπεῖν ἔχομεν. — ὡς τετηρήκαμεν ἐπὶ τῷ, ἐδεῖς αγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἴς
ὁ θεός, (οὐδὲ γέ ἐκεῖ ἔαυτὸν ἔξω πθεῖς τῷ τῷ αγαθῷ φύσεως ὁ πῦν
τῶντα λέγει, ἀλλὰ, ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρῶτον αγαθὸν ὁ πατὴρ, πο
ὺδεῖς συνυπακομένῳ τῷ πρώτῳ, τὸ δεύτερον εἰρῆνται πιστεύομεν.)
ἔτω καὶ τὸ, ἐδεῖς οἰδε, τὸν πρώτην ἔμνοντα τῷ τῷ ὄντων καὶ τῷ ἔο
μένων, ἐπὶ τῷ πατέρᾳ αὐτοῖς Θ, καὶ διὰ πάντων τὸν πρώτην αἰ-
πίαν τοῖς αὐθεόποιοι ὑποδεικνύοντος, εἰρῆνται νομίζομεν. Ad Am-
philech. Epist. 391.

The next Text to be consider'd is Job. 14. 28.
My Father is greater than I. A Text, one would think, they should blush to read, who presume in Opposition to it to assert, that the Father is *not* greater than the Son ; that the Son is absolutely *co-ordinate* and *equal* to the Father in *Nature* and all *essential Perfections* : and that the Father is so far from being, in any Respect, *greater* than the Son ; that it was possible, that he himself *might have acted the ministerial Part* ; and so that it might have been as well and truly written, that he who is in the Scripture call'd *Son* is *greater* than him who is call'd his *Father*.

The *Socinian Interpretation* of these Words, which the Scholastic Trinitarians also sometimes flee to for Refuge, viz. that God the Father is *greater* than *a mere Man*, or than the *mere human Nature* of Christ, is so low and mean that the old *Athanasians* themselves were ashame'd of it.

Therefore *Gregory Nazianzen* says, “ * To affirm that the Father is *greater* than Christ, consider'd merely as *a Man*, is true indeed, but no great Thing to say : for what wonder is it that “ God should be *greater* than *a Man*? ” And it was the unanimous Doctrine of the antient Church that God the Father, as being alone *supreme over all*, was *superior* to, and *greater* than the Son, in *Nature* and all *divine Perfections* ; in *Power*, *Authority*, *Dominion* and *Worship*.

Justin Martyr says, † “ He that is in Heaven is *Lord* even over him who is *Lord* upon Earth [speaking of Christ appearing before his Incarna-

* Τὸ δὲ δῆ λέγειν, ὅπερ τῷ καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπον νοεῖν μείζων, ἀληθὲς μὲν, καὶ μέγα δὲ· πι γὰρ θαυμασόν, εἰ μείζων ἀνθρώπος θεός; Orat. 36.

† Ὅς [ἐν τοῖς ἐγνῶσι ὑπάρχων] καὶ τῷ δῆτὶ γῆς κνεῖς κνεῖος ἐστιν, ὡς παῖς τῷ θεῷ, ἀπότος τε αὐτῷ τῷ εἶναι, καὶ δυνατός καὶ κνεῖα καὶ θεῷ. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 121.

"*tion on Gen. 19. 24.] being his Father and God,*
 " and the Author of his Existence, even tho he
 " himself also be *powerful*, and *Lord*, and *God*." And
 he every where denys Christ, tho God, to be [*ὁ πομ-
 τὴς τῶν ὅλων*] the absolute or supreme Maker of the
 Universe: but declares, that he is *subject* to him,
 and *sent* by him.

And *Irenæus* from this Text infers (as hath been
 just observ'd) that the Father is *above all*; and de-
 clar'd by our Lord himself to be *superior* to him
 the Son in *Knowledge*. Agreeably hereto he says
 elsewhere, * " that our Lord himself taught his
 Disciples, that the Father only is that *Lord* and
 " *God*, who is the *only God* and *Ruler over all*."

Tertullian comparing the *only-begotten Son* to
 the *unbegotten Father* says, † " that which is
 " *unoriginated* is more *powerful* than that which is
 " *originated*—because that which had no *Cause*
 " of its Existence will always be much *superior* to
 " that, which had a *Cause* of its Existence." Hence
 he says in another Place; || " The Father is the
 " whole (divine) Substance, of which the Son is a
 " *derivative Part*; [like a *Ray* from the *Sun*, which
 " is his Comparison] he himself declaring, *My*
 " *Father is greater than I.*"

Origen says, as *Huetius* interprets his corrupted
 Greek; " It is a greater Thing that the Son of
 " Man is glorify'd by God, the *Inferior* by the
 " *Superior*, than that he who is *inferior* should have

* *Ipsò Domino Patrem tantum Deum & Dominum eum qui
 solus est Deus & Dominator omnium tradente discipulis, sequi
 nos oportet. Lib. 3. c. 9.*

† *Innatum nato fortius; — quia quod ut esset, nullius
 eguit auctoris, multo sublimius erit eo, quod ut esset, aliquem
 habuit auctorem. Cont. Hermog. c. 18.*

|| *Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero derivatio totius & por-
 tio, sicut ipse profitetur quia Pater major me est. Adv. Prax.
 c. 9.*

" *glorify'd*

" glorify'd him who is greater God, agreeably to
" the Words, The Father who sent me is greater
" than I *."

Again, " the Father is superior to, and greater
" than the Word."

Again, " we affirm, that the Son is *not more*
" *powerful*, but that he is *less powerful* than the
" Father ; according to his own Words, *the Fa-*
" *ther who sent me is greater than I.*—We say
" that our Saviour, whom we acknowledge to be
" God the Word, beareth Rule over all Things
" which are made subject to him ; but not over
" his Father and God, who bears rule over
" him."

Again, " we say that our Saviour, with the Holy
" Ghost, not only comparatively, but superemi-
" nently excells all the Things that were made
" (By him) being yet himself *excell'd* by the Fa-
" ther as much, or even more than he and the Holy
" Ghost excell the other Creatures [viz. Thrones,
" Angels, &c.] But notwithstanding he who excells
" such and so great Beings in *Essence* and *Dignity*
" and *Power* and *Godhead* [for he is the living

* Majus est, quod Filius hominis gloriificatus fuerit per Deum,
inferior per praestantiores, quam quod inferior gloriificaverit
Deum praestantiores ; juxta illud : *Pater qui misit me major me*
est, Com. in Joh. p. 417. κρείττων καὶ μείζων [ό πατήρ] τοῦδε. τὸ
λόγον ibid. p. 56. φαμὲν τὸ οὖν ἐκ ἰδουμέτερον τῷ πατρὶς ἀλλ᾽
ιποτίσεσθαι. καὶ τῷ πάτερι αὐτῷ πειθόμενοι εἰπόντες τὸ ο πατήρ
ἰστεμέντας με μείζων μη ἔστι.—κεχειρί—φαμὲν τὸ σωτῆρα μάλιστα.
πειθόμεν αὐτὸν θεὸν λόγον—πάντων μὲν τῷ οὐ ποτε παγμένων
αὐτῷ, καθὼ τὰυτά ἔστιν. ἀλλ᾽ οὐχὶ καὶ τῷ κεχειρί Θεῷ αὐτὸν πατρὸς
καὶ θεός. Cont. Cels. lib. 8. p. 388. παντῶν μὲν τῷ γεννητῷ οὐ περέχεται,
καὶ συγκείται ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πειθαλλέσθαι οὐ περιχῇ φαμὲν τὸ σωτῆρα καὶ τὸ
παντα μα τὸ ἄγνοιον, ΤΠΕΡΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ ποστον οὐ καὶ φλέον αἴπο
τῷ πατρὶς, δοσω οὐ περέχεται αὐτὸς καὶ ἄγνοιον των λοιπῶν,
τοτῶν τυχόντων—ἀλλ᾽ οὐμας τῷ ποστον καὶ τηλικέτων οὐ περέχεται
τοια καὶ πρεσβεία καὶ μυνάμεν καὶ θεοτόπιον (έμιτυχος γε ἔστι λόγος καὶ
πορία) καὶ συγκείται καθ᾽ οὐδὲν τῷ πατεῖ. Com. in Jo. p. 218.

"Word and Wisdom] is nevertheless not in any
"Thing compar'd to the Father."

Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, and Origen's Scholar, * taught not only a Distinction of Person (in the Father and the Son) but a Difference of Substance; and that the Son was inferior to the Father in Power and Glory.

† Theognostus another of Origen's Scholars taught the same Doctrine.

‡ Novatian says, that the Son as being originated is inferior to the Father.

And Eusebius || shews "that the Word of God who existed before the World, and is more excellent than every Angelic Nature, is less excellent than the first Cause."

And this Doctrine that the Father is greater than the Son, which was unanimously taught by the ancient Antenicene Church, was also profess'd by the Niceses and Postniceses likewise.

Alexander of Alexandria says, ** "therefore we must reserve to the unbegotten Father this peculiar Preeminence, that no one is the Cause of his Existence."

The Council of Syrmium says, †† "it is indisplicable that the Father is greater than the Son in Honour, Dignity and Divinity, the Son himself declaring, my Father is greater than I."

* Cited above.

† See Cave's Hist. Lit. p. 98.

‡ Simul ut hic minor sit, dum in illo esse se scit, habeas originem, quia nascitur. De Trinit. c. 31.

|| "Ειν δ' αὐτὸς ὁ τομὴ αἰώνων τε θεῖ λόγος Θ., ὁ κρίτης μὲν πᾶσας ἀγγελικῆ φύσις, ΜΕΙΩΝ δὲ ἦν καὶ τὸ τομὴν αἰώνων. Dem. Evang. lib. 5. c. 11. vid. lib. 5. c. 30. & lib. 6. p. 257. proam.

** Epist. apud Socrat. & Theodore. cited above.

* ΜΕΙΖΟΝΑ ἐνας τὸ πατέρα ποιεῖ καὶ αξία καὶ θεότητα. ap. Socrat. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2.

And

And *Basil* himself declares as much, * “ the Son (says he) is *second* to the Father, in *Order* (of Nature) as being from him; and also in *Dignity*, because the Father is the Original and Cause of his Existence ; and, because thro’ him, we have Access to God even the Father.” *Hilary’s Opinion* has been shewn above ; and to put this Matter out of all Dispute, Bishop *Bull* himself has confess’d, † “ that *Origen’s Doctrine*, that the Son, even as he is God, is *less* than the Father, is plainly the Catholic Doctrine, main-tain’d even by the Fathers, after the Council of *Nice*, who most strongly oppos’d the Arian Opinion.”

Another Text sufficient to silence the vain Pretenses of modern Scholastic Orthodoxy that the *only true God* is the *Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, is *John* 17. 3. where our Saviour in his Prayer to his Father says, “ This is Life eternal, that they may know *Thee, the only true God*, and Jesus Christ “ whom thou hast sent.” Parallel to this Text is that other of the same Apostle, *i John* 5. 20. “ And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding that we may know the true God [τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεόν, so the Original, according to the best and oldest MSS] and we are in him that is true [the true God] in [it shou’d be render’d, *By*] his Son Jesus Christ.

† ‘Οὐδὲ τὰξει μὲν δέντες τῷ πατρὶς, ὅπλον ἀπ’ ἔκεινος. καὶ αὖται, ὅπλον ἀπὸν καὶ αἵτια τῷ εἶναι αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὅπλον αὐτῷ ἀπόδοσις καὶ περισταγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ πατέρα. *Advers. Eunom.* lib. 3. p. 79.

‡ Quod origines in loco citato dicit, Filium etiam qua Deus est — Patre minorem esse ; — plane catholicum esse, atque etiam a Patribus, qui post Nicænum concilium Arianam heresin acerrime impugnârunt, defensum — ostendemus. *Def. F. N.* § 2. c. 9. See *Not. apud Novat. edit. Jackson*, p. 365. 366. and 387—391. and Reply to Dr. *Waterland’s Defense*, Q. 1, 2.

“ This is the true God [mention'd in the former
“ Part of the Verse, and to the Knowledge of
“ whom Christ came to bring us, and in whom we
“ are By him] and eternal Life.”

In those two Texts it is so evident that God the Father, in Contradistinction to the Son, is stil'd *the only true God*, that not only the antient *Antemcene* Church ever taught and profess'd that the Father alone was *the one and only true God*; and that Christ, as being *sent by him*, was *inferior and subject to him*: but even the *Nicenes* and *Postnicenes* themselves understood these Texts of God the Father; and both acknowledg'd the Father in Distinction to the Son to be *the only true God*; and never stil'd the Son so, but, on the contrary, confess'd that his *Mission* from the Father declar'd his *Subordination and Subjection to him*.

Iraenæus says, “ * our Lord himself taught his Disciples that the *Father only* is that Lord and God, who is the *only God* and Ruler overall.”

From *John* 17. 3. † *Origen* infers, that the Father only is *absolutely God* [$\delta\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$] as being [$\alpha\nu\tau\theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$] of *himself God*, or *unoriginated*. And says, “ that the Father, who *sent the Son*, is alone both [absolutely] good, and greater than him who is sent.”

On Account that the Father is the only true God and sent the Son, *Theophilus* the antient Bishop of, *Antioch* says, ‡ “ that the Word being God, and begotten of God, the Father of the

* *Ipsò Domino Patrem tantùm Deum & Dominum eum, qui solus est Deus & dominator omnium, tradente discipulis, lib. 3. c. 9.*

† *Com. in Joh. p. 46.* ‘Ο γδ πέμπτας αὐτὸν πατίρι—
ἘτΘ χ, μόνος ἀγαθὸς κ, μείζων τῶν πεμφθέντων. *ibid. p. 130.*

‡ Θεὸς δὲν ὁν ὁ λόγος χ, ἐκ θεοῦ περικυώς, ὅποτι ἀν βέλει
ο πατήρ τῷ δὲν δλων, πέμπτη αὐτὸν εἰς τινα τόπον. *ad Autolyc. τι*
μὲν θεὸν τῶν δλων ἀσβετὲς ἀγγελον νομίσαι καλεῖσθαι. *Synod. Antioch.* *adv. Paul. Samosat.*

“ Uni-

" Universe sends him to any Place, whenever he " wills so to do." But to suppose the Father, the " God of the Universe, to be an Angel or to be " sent, was esteemed the greatest Impiety."

In like Manner Novatian observes, " moreover " he (our Lord) declares that he was *sent*; that by " this Instance of Obedience which Christ the Lord " shewed in coming when he was sent, he might " be prov'd to be not the *Father*, but the *Son*: " who would certainly have been the *Sender*, had " he been the *Father*: but the *Father* was not *sent*, " left by being *sent*, he should thereby be found " subject to another *God**."

Eusebius says, that Christ was + " sent by one " who is Greater than He. And that the *Pree-*
" minence of the Father's Glory is shewn, in *send-*
" ing the Son, and the Son's being *Sent*."

‡ " In this respect especially (says Hilary) the " Son is not *compar'd* or *equal* to the Father, in " that he is by an absolute Obedience *subject to* " him—that he is *sent*; that he *receives* all from " him; and that in all Things he *obeys* the *Will* " of him that *Sent* him:—hence there is but *one* " *God*; and both the *Subjection* and *Dignity* of the " Son is declar'd to us—He being by *Obedience*, " as well as in *Name*, *subject to the Father*."

* *Missum autem præterea se esse dicit, ut per hanc obedi-
tiam qua venit Dominus Christus missus, non Pater, sed Filius
probetur; qui misisset utiq; si Pater fuisset: missus autem non
fuit Pater, ne Pater subditus alteri Deo, dum mittitur, probare-
tur, c. 27. edit. Jackson. absit Deum Patrem Angelum dicere;
ne alteri subditus sit, cuius Angelus fuerit. c. 18.* so plainly in
the Sense of the Antients, did the *Mission* of Christ the Son of
God imply his *Obedience* and *Subjection* to the supreme Authority
of the Father.

† Πρὸς τὸν ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟΣ ἀπεσαλμένον. *Prep. Evang.* lib. 7.
c. 12. ὑπερέχον τῆς δόξης τὸν παῖδας παισίνος διὰ τὸν ἄπε-
σαλκένατο, ἐντὸν δὲ ἀπεσαλθει. *Eccles. Theolog.* lib. 2. c. 7.

|| P. 234. cited above.

And

And Bishop Bull himself confesseth, * " that
God the Father having no Original is subject to
none ; and can no more be said to be sent, than
to be begotten by another. On the contrary the
Son of God, as being begotten of God the Father,
does on that Account certainly owe all his Power
to the Father as receiv'd from him : nor is it less
honourable for him to be sent, than to be begotten
of the Father."

In the preceding Words Bishop *Bull* plainly disavows Dr. *W*'s Notion, that there is no *natural Subjection* of the Son to the *Father*; for he places the *Supremacy* of the Father, and his not being in *Subjection* to another, in his being by Nature *unoriginate*; and the *Mission* and *Subjection* of the Son to the Father, in his being by Nature *originated from the Father*.

Athanasius in his first and best Writings, before he became the Head of a Party, strongly asserted the antient Doctrine of the Church, that the Father is *the only true God*, in Distinction to the Son. “ + The Knowledge (faith he) of the ONE, and “ *only true God*, I mean, the Father of Christ.” Again,

"The true God who is strictly and absolutely such, even the Father of Christ." Again,

* A nullo ille ortus principio nulli subjectus est; neq; magis ab alio missus, quam ab alio natus dici potest. Contra, *Filius Dei*, qua ex Deo Patre natus, eo certe nomine Patri suam omnem auctoritatem acceptam refert; neq; minus ipsi *honorificum*: Patre mitti quam ex Patre nasci. *Def. F. N.* § 4. c. 3.

† Τῆς περὶ τὸ ἔνα καὶ μόνον αἰλιθινὸν θεὸν γνώσεως, λέγω δὲ
τὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ ταῦτα. Cont. Gent.

Τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὄντας ὁ Λαθεδὸν ἢ τῷ χειρὶ πατέρεσ; ibid.
Τὸν πας ἡρών πρεστάτην γέμενον καὶ κηρυττόμενον, τῷ τον μὲν
ἔγειται θεὸν αἰλιθῷ, ἢ καὶ τὴν κηπίσσεων καύσεων καὶ πάσους ὑποστάσεων
μημιγερῷν τίς δὲ εὖ ἐστιν ἐτΘ ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ πανάγιος καὶ ὑπερέκεντος
πάσους γεννήσις ὅστις ὁ τῷ χειρὶ πατήσ; ibid.

"He

“ He whom we preach and worship is the
“ ONLY TRUE GOD, the Lord of the Crea-
“ tion, and the Author of every Being ; and who
“ else is this Person, but the most holy Father
“ of Christ, and who is far above all deriv’d Be-
“ ings ? ”

I shall conclude the Sense of the Antients in their Application of the preceeding Texts *John 17. 3. 1 John 5. 20.* to God the Father, to prove from thence, that the Title of *the only true God*, and *the true God*, peculiarly belong’d to him *only*, with a remarkable Passage of an unsuspected Author, viz. *Epiphanius*, whereby it appears that in his Time, the Titles of *the only true God*, and *the true God* mention’d in these Texts, were universally understood to be ascrib’d to the Father only.

* “ The Son Himself saith concerning the Fa-
“ ther, *that they may know Thee, the only true God*.
“ But that faithful Witness who lean’d upon his
“ Breast, and call’d him the only-begotten God,
“ did not give him the Title of *true God* : but the
“ Father is declar’d by him to be *the true God*,
“ and the Son the *only-begotten God*. Again, it is
“ written of the Father, *God is Light* ; but of the
“ Son, that he was *the true Light*. And here ob-
“ serve the Accuracy of Scripture — it is written

* Περὶ τῆς πατρὸς αὐτὸς ὁ ὄντος λέγει· ἵνα γνώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον αἰλιθιὸν θεόν. ἀξιόπισος δὲ μάρτυς ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ εἶθος αὐτῷ ἀναπεσῶν, μονογενὴν θεὸν αὐτὸν φασκαν. καὶ ωργούθετο δὲ τῷ μονογενὲι θεῷ τῷ, ΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ. αλλὰ περὶ πατρὸς γέγραπται, ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ· περὶ γέ, δὲ, ὅπ μονογενὴς θεός. τὸ δὲ πάλιν περὶ πατρὸς, ὅτι φῶς ὁ θεός· περὶ δὲ γέ, δὲ, ἢν τὸ φῶς τὸ αἰλιθιὸν. καὶ δρα μοι τὸν τόμῳ γραφῶν ἀκεβηταν — δὴ τῷ γέ γέγραπται, ὅπ θεός ὁ ὄντος. καὶ κανὶ καὶ περιστεται τῷ, θεός ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ, μανίαν ἔσυποις ἐποφεύομεν, εἰ τολμήσομεν βλασφημῆσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν τὸν θεόν ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΝ. — τὸ μὲν πάλιν τῷ, ΘΕΟΣ ΑΛΗΘΙΝΟΣ, τῷ δὲ γέ τῷ, θεός. ἀνάπταλιν δὲ τῷ γέ τῷ, φῶς τὸ αἰλιθιὸν, πὼ δὲ πατρὶ τῷ, φῶς, Ancorat. Sect. 3, 4. vid Heres 69. Sect. 32. & 76. c. 36. Sect. 2.

" of the Son, that he is (*Θεὸς*) God, and tho' the
 " Title of the true God is not there ascrib'd to
 " him, we shou'd be mad to deny that the Son is
 " true God.—The Father therefore is in Scripture
 " stil'd the true God, but the Son barely God; on
 " the other Hand the Son is stil'd the true Light,
 " but the Father barely Light." Thus this Atha-
 nasiian Writer confesses, that the Son is never call'd
the true God in the Scriptures, even whilst by Way
 of Inference he endeavours to prove in Contradicti-
 on to them, that the Son is *the true God*. Dr. W.
 every where asserts and insists, that Christ is to be
 pray'd to and worship'd as *the supreme God*, in plain
 and direct Contradiction to the following Texts of
 Scripture, and the unanimous Sense of the antient
 Church.

Luke 11. 2. Our Saviour teaches his Disciples
 how to pray, in these Words ; " when ye pray,
 " say, *our Father which art in Heaven, &c.*"

Again, " In that Day ye shall ask me nothing:
 " verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye
 " shall ask *the Father in my Name*, He will give it
 " you. *John 16. 23.*

" There is *one God*, and *one Mediator* between
 " God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus. *1 Tim.*
 " *2. 5.*

These, amongst other numerous Places of Scrip-
 ture, instruct us in the Object of Christian Wor-
 ship: and teach us that God, the Father of our
 Lord Jesus Christ, is the alone supreme and ulti-
 mate Object of our Adoration and Prayer. The
 Scriptures never direct us to pray to Christ or the
 Holy Ghost; but the Command of Christ, and
 the Practice of his Apostles, which is our best and
 only Rule, concur in the offering up all Prayer
 and religious Worship to the only true God, the
 Father, *in the Name of Christ*, who is the only
 true *Mediator*, between God and Men: And what-
 ever

ever religious Honour or Worship is in Scripture given to the Son, it is never founded on his divine Nature or Essence, or on his *Original* and *supreme Authority* and *Dominion*, (on which the Worship of God the Father is founded) but on his *becoming Man*, on his being *appointed* to be *Mediator*; on the Father's having *committed* all *Judgment* to him, Job. 5. 22, 27. It is also given him by the *Command* of the Father (Heb. 1. 6.) and is not *supreme* or *ultimate*, but tends *finally* to the *Glory of God the Father*, Phil. 2. 11. The Worship therefore of Christ is *mediate, relative* and *subordinate*; and they who worship Christ otherwise than the Scripture directs him to be worship'd, pretending to be wise above what is written, do, with the foolish *Samaritans*, *worship they know not what*, John 4. 22. whereas the true *Worshippers* of God, as our Lord adds, v. 23. *worship the Father in Spirit and Truth*, in the Name, and through the *Mediation* of Jesus Christ his Son our Lord.

This was the concurrent *Doctrine* of the antient Church. The antient Book entitled the *Apostolical Constitutions*, informs us of the primitive Method of religious Worship.

* " We declare unto you (say they) that there is " only one God Almighty, besides whom there " is no other; and that you must worship and " adore him alone, *through* Jesus Christ our Lord, " *in the most holy Spirit.*"

Polycarp the Apostolical Bishop of *Smyrna* at his Martyrdom pray'd thus; † " for this Cause a-

R " bove

* Διηγείμεν οὐκον θεὸν παντοπρότοεξ ἔνα μόνον ὑπάρχειν, παρ' οὐ ἄλλος ἐκ ἐστιν. καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον σέβειν καὶ περσκυνεῖν διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατεῖν ιμῶν, ἐν τῷ παντάπειρον πνεύματι. lib. 6. c. 14. vid. lib. 2. c. 56. lib. 5. c. 15. lib. 6. c. 9. lib. 7. c. 37, 38, 43.

† Διδούσι τοι πει πάντων σὲ αἰνῶ, σὲ εὐλογῶ, σὲ διδούσι, διδούσι αἰνῶν αρχερέως Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ αἰγαλεῖ σε παιδίσκος.

" above all Things I praise Thee, I bleſſ Thee,
 " I glorify Thee, thro' the eternal high Priest
 " Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son: through whom,
 " and with whom, in the holy Spirit, be Glory
 " to Thee now and for ever and ever. Amen."

Justin Martyr says ; * " there are no Nations
 " upon Earth, in which Prayers and Thanks-
 " givings are not put up to the Father and Ma-
 " ker of all Things, through the Name of Je-
 " sus who was crucify'd." Again ; " The Mi-
 " nister taking [the Bread and Cup] gives Praise
 " and Glory to the Father of all, thro' the Name
 " of the Son, and thro' the Holy Ghost." And
 this he tells us was the Rule in all religious Ob-
 lations at the Lord's Supper.

This primitive Martyr tells us farther, † that
 next after the unbegotten God, they also worship'd
 the Son by his Command, in the second Place, or
 in subordination to Him.

Melito the antient Bishop of *Sardis*, delivers the
 Christian Doctrine in these Words ; ‡ " we do not
 " worship Beings that have no ſenſe, but the on-
 " ly God who is before all and above all, even
 " above Christ himſelf who is truly God the
 " Word."

παιδὸς δὶ ἐστὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ δόξῃ, νῦν τοι
 εἰς τὰς μέλλοντας ἀιώνας τῶν ἀιώνων. Αμήν. apud Euseb. Hist.
 Eccles. lib. 4. c. 15.

* Ἐγ γοὶ μὴ διὰ τὸ ὄνοματος τῷ σαυρωθέντις Ἰησῷ εὐχαρι-
 τεύχασιν τῷ πατεῖ καὶ ποιητῇ τῶν ὅλων κίνητας. Dial. p.
 112. Ἐπὶ λαβὼν ἀνιον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατεῖ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τὸ
 ὄνοματος τῷ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀναπέμπει. Apol. 2.
 p. 161. vid. p. 162.

† Apol. 1. p. 24. edit. Grab. Apol. 2. p. 34, 35. Dial. p. 97.
 edit. Steph.

‡ Οὐκ ἔσμεν ὁδεμίαν ἀιώνων ἔχόντων θεραπευταὶ ἀλλὰ
 μόνος θεῖς τῷ περὶ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ Χειρὶ ἀν-
 τὸντως θεῖς λόγος. Apud Chron. Alex. ad Olymp. 230. 2. p.
 607.

And *Irenæus* has this most solemn Prayer ; *
 " I call upon Thee, O Lord, the God of Abraham, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ;
 " who art the *only and true God*, above whom
 " there is no other God : through our Lord Jesus Christ."

" † If thou wilt (says *Clemens Alexandrinus*) be thou initiated ; and thou shalt be in the Chorus with Angels praising the unbegotten and incorruptible and only true God : *God the Word* joining with us in our Hymns of Praise. This Jesus, the one eternal great High Priest of the *one God who is the Father*, prays for Men."

The next antient Writer is the most learned *Origen*, who gives us the fullest and clearest Account of the Distinction of the Worship of the Father and the Son. " ‡ We ought (says he) to send up all Supplication, and Prayer, and Intercession, and Thanksgiving, to the supreme God over all, through our High Priest, the living Word and God, who is above all Angels : yet we may also offer Supplications, and Intercessions, and Thanksgiving, and Prayer, to the Word Himself, if we can distinguish between

* *Ego igitur invoco te, Domine Deus Abraham* —————

Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi : ————— qui es solus & unus Deus, super quem alias Deus non est, per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, &c. *adv. Hæres.* lib. 3. c. 6. And he uses the Worship due unto the Son of God upon the [εὐδοκία] Good pleasure of the Father. *Lib. 1. c. 10.*

† Εἰ βέλει, καὶ σὺ μᾶς, καὶ χρεύσεις μετ' ἀγγέλων ἀμφὶ σεγένητον καὶ αἱώλεθον καὶ μόνον ὅντος θεὸν συρυμνεῖσος περὶ θεοῦ λόγου ἀτίλος ὃς τοι Ιησοῦς εἶς ὁ μέγας αἱχθερεύς τε ἐντὸς τῆς αὐτῆς καὶ παῖρος ὑπὲρ αὐθερώπων εὑχεται. *Exhor.* 74, 75.

‡ Πάσαν μὲν γὰρ θέντιν, καὶ περσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐεστίαν, αὐτομητέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων μέλων αἱχθερέως, ἐμβύχε λόγῳ καὶ τεοῦ. Δεπόμεθα δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἔντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔυχασιντομεν, καὶ εποιέσομεθα δὲ, ἐὰν μυράμεθα κατακέν της τεὶ περσευχῆς νεολεῖας καὶ καταχρήστων. *Adv. Cels.* lib. 5. p. 233.

“ Prayer in a *proper*, and Prayer in a *figurative*
 “ Sense.” And what he means by this Distinction
 of Prayer in a *proper* Sense, when offer’d to God
 the Father, and Prayer in an *improper* or *figura-*
tive Sense, when offer’d to Christ, he thus explains
 in another Place ; * “ we worship (says he) the
 “ one God, and his one Son, and Word, and
 “ Image, with Supplications, and Prayers to the
 “ utmost of our Power : putting up our Prayers
 “ to the God of the Universe, through his only
 “ begotten Son : to whom we offer them first,
 “ desiring Him as being the Propitiation for our
 “ Sins, to present as our high Priest, our Prayers
 “ and Sacrifices [Thanksgivings] and Intercessi-
 “ ons to the supreme God.”

Again, in his Book concerning *Prayer*, he very
 fully and distinctly shews the Rule of worship
 practis’d by the antient Church. “ + If we un-
 “ derstand (says he) what *Prayer* is, (meaning ul-
 “ timate in contradistinction to *mediatorial*) we must
 “ not pray to any deriv’d Being, no not to Christ
 “ himself, but only to the God and Father of the
 “ Universe : to whom also our Saviour Himself
 “ pray’d (as I have shewn before) and teacheth
 “ us to pray unto him. For being ask’d (by one
 “ of his Disciples) viz. *teach us to pray* ; he doth
 “ not teach us to pray to Himself, but to the Fa-
 “ ther ; and that we shou’d say, *our Father who*
 “ *art in Heaven.*” Again, “ we ought (says he)
 “ to pray to God only, the Father of all ; but not

* Αλλὰ τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτὸς καὶ λόγον, καὶ εἰς
 γε, τὰς κατὰ τὸ συναπόνητον ἡμῶν ικεσίας καὶ αξιώσεως σεβασμού<sup>πρεσβάτοντες τῷ θεῷ τῶν δλῶν τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τῆς μονογενῆς αὐτῆς. Ὡς πρῶτην πρεσβύτερομεν αὐτᾶς, αξιώντες αὐτὸν, οἰασμόν ταν τὸν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, πρεσβάτου γένεν ὡς αὐτοῦ πρέσβεα καὶ εὐχαῖς καὶ τὰς θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμῶν τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. Adu.
 Cels. lib. 8. p. 386. see p. 384.</sup>

+ De Orat. p. 50, 51, 52, 53. edit Wetsten.

“ without

" without our High-Priest.—— Therefore the
 " Saints in their Eucharistical Prayers, give Thanks
 " to God through Jesus Christ. And as he that
 " prays in the strict and proper Sense, ought not
 " to pray to him (primarily and ultimately) who
 " himself prays ; but to the Father, whom our
 " Lord Jesus taught us to invoke in our Pray-
 " ers ; so ought no Prayer to be offer'd to the
 " Father without Him, John 16. 23, 24." Whence
 he concludes that we ought always to pray to
 the Father *in his Name*. And as our Prayers ought
 to be offer'd up to God the Father *through Christ* ;
 so he observes farther, that the * *Doxology* in the
 End of our Prayers, ought likewise to be offer'd
 to God *through Christ*, and *in the Holy Ghost*.

Lastly, *Eusebius* says ; † " the only-begotten
 " of God and first-born of the Universe, the Be-
 " ginning of all Things commands us to esteem
 " his Father the *only true God*, and to worship
 " him alone."

From the preceding Passages, to which many
 more might be added, on the Point of Worship,
 it is as evident and demonstrable as a Matter can
 be, that as the antient Church always profess'd it
 as the Scripture-doctrine, that God the Father only
 was *the only true God*, and the supreme Maker
 of the Universe ; so likewise it taught that he only
 ought to be invoked and worship'd, in the
biggest, strict and proper Sense of Prayer and Wor-
 ship ; i. e. as the *Original, primary and ultimate Ob-*
ject of all religious Adoration : that as the Holy
 Ghost was never stil'd *God or Lord*, so he was ne-
 ver invoked in Prayer at all : and that, as the

* p. 145, 146.

† Αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πρωτότοκος τῶν ὅλων ἐ^{πί}πον οὐρανοῦ, τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα μόνον ἡγεῖσθαι θεῖν αἰνιθῆ, καὶ μόνον σεβεῖν ἡμῖν παραχωρεύεται. Prep. Evang. lib. 7. p. 327.

Son was *inferior* to the Father, and always subject unto him, and was constituted by him to be our *High-Priest, Saviour, Advocate, and Judge*: so the Father was worship'd and pray'd to *Through him*, and *in his Name*; and He himself was invoked in a mediate and subordinate Sense, that he might (as our Mediator) offer up, and by his Mediation render effectual our Prayers to the one God and Father of all. But it never was the Doctrine or Practice of the antient Church to worship Christ as being the supreme God, or the same God with the Father; as Dr. W. pretends, and most grossly misrepresents it, and abuses his Readers in so doing.

Two Texts more remain to be consider'd in order to conclude this Treatise. *Prov. 8. 22.* "The Lord possess'd [ἐκτίσει Gr. created] me in the Beginning of his Way, before his Works of old." Parallel to this is *Coloff. 1. 15.* "who is the Image of the invisible God, the first-born of every Creature." In the first Text *Wisdom* there spoken of was understood by the Antients, to be meant of Christ the Son of God, who is also in the new Testament call'd the *Wisdom of God*, *1 Cor. 1. 24.* And the Antients also understood the Text, as render'd by the Greek Interpreters, viz. that Christ or *Wisdom* was *created* by God: the Antient Jews likewise, as appears from the *Chaldee Paraphrase* understood the Word render'd *possess'd*, to signify *created*, as the Greek version of the *Seventy*, and the old *Syriac* version have it; and as the * Word signifies elsewhere. So that they who alledge that the Word signifies, *possess'd*, as distinct from being *created*, shew plainly that they have an Hypo-

* The Hebrew Word is *Kanah* which the Greek translates again *created*, *Gen. 14. 19.* and *Maimonides* likewise on *Gen. 14. 22.* the *Chaldee Paraphrase* renders it by *Bara*, which signifies *created*; so that it is very weak to suppose that instead of [ἐκποτεῖ] *created*, the right rendering shou'd be [ἐκποτεῖ] *possess'd*.

thesis to serve, and want a Pretense to support it.

Upon the other Text, *Coloff. i. 15.* * *Isidore of Pelusium*, a zealous *Athanaian* owns that the Word [*πρωτότοκος*] first-born, signifies the same as [*πρωτότιγος*] first-created. And therefore contends that the Word ought to be read by a change of Accent [*πρωτοτόνος*] to signify that Christ is not the first-born, but the first or *Prime-Creator*: making the Apostle's sense plainly absurd.

But the Antients understood the two preceding Texts in their plain and obvious Sense to teach that Christ, the *Word* and *Wisdom* of God, was created; and never scrupled to affirm and profess that he was a *Creature*: not meaning that he was one of, or like one of the inferior Creatures which God made By Him; but that he was (in an ineffable Manner) the immediate *Creation* and *offspring* of God; deriv'd (without any secondary Cause) by the *Power* and *Will* of the one supreme God and Father of all.

Thus the antient *Apostolical + Constitutions* stile the Son, that *Wisdom which God created*.

† *Melito* wrote a Treatise, concerning the *Creation of Christ*.

** *Tertullian* comparing the only-begotten *Word* (the Son) with the Father, says; “ that the Father is prior to him; and as being unoriginated “ is more powerful than He who is originated;

* *Lib. 3. Epist. 31.*

† Οπως εις μνημην ερχωμεθα της υπο σφη κποθειον σοφι-
ας. *Lib. 7. c 36.*

‡ Πειτη κποσως Χεισ. *Cav. in vit. Melito. p. 183. & Hist.*
Lit. p. 43.

*** Quale est ut Filio Dei sermone unigenito & primogenito
aliquid tuerit praeter Patrem *Antiquius*, & hoc modo utique
generosius; nedum quod innatum nato fortius, & quod infec-
tum factio validius, &c. *Adv. Hermog. c. 18. see adv. Prax.*

" and being *unmade* is mightier than he who is
" made." And yet he thought Christ, as he thought
humane Souls, to be produc'd or created from the
Substance of God.

* Clemens Alexandrinus alluding to the Text of
Proverbs before-cited, calls Christ, *the Wisdom*
which God first-created. And Photius and Jerom
charge him with making the Son a *Creature*.

Origen, whose Orthodoxy Dr. W. makes no
Question of, is known to have made the Son and
Spirit Creatures.

Of this, † Epiphanius, Jerom, Justinian and Pho-
tius are ample and unexceptionable Witnesses.

‡ Dionysius of Alexandria, ** Gregory of Ne-
cajarea, and ‡ Theognostus of Alexandria, all of
them

* Σοφίας τῆς πρωπητίσυ τῷ θεῷ. Strom. p. 591. τὸν γάρ
εἰς κτίσμα διάγει. de Clem. Phot. Cod. 109. Clementem quoq;
—virum catholicum scribit in libris suis interdum Dei
Filium dicere creaturam. Apol. 2. adv. Ruffin.

† Φαερώτατα τὸν υἱὸν τῷ θεῷ κτίσμα ἐδογμάτω — μὴ
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον κτίσον εἰσογένεσθαι. Epiph. Hæres 64. § 5.
vid. et 8. Christum Filium Dei non natum esse sed factum —
Deum Patrem esse lumen incomprehensibile, Christum colia-
tione Patris, splendorem esse perparvum — tertium dig-
nitatem & honore post Patrem & Filium asserit Spiritum Sanctum;
de quo, cum ignorare se dicat utrum factus sit an infectus; in
posterioribus, quid de eo sentiret, expressit; nihil absque solo
Deo Patre, infectum esse confirmans. Hieron. Epist. ad Arian.
vid. Apol. 2. adv. Ruffin. See Reply to Dr. W's Defense, Qu. 12.
ὅποιοι οἱ υἱὸι καὶ τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα κτίσματα εἰσι. Justin. Epist.
ad Menam. Τὸν μὲν υἱὸν ὑπὸ τῷ παλέος πεποιηθεῖται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦ-
μα ὑπὸ τῷ θεῷ. Phot. Cod. 58.

‡ Nihil creatum aut serviens in Trinitate credamus, ut vult
Dionysius fons Arii. Gennad. lib. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 4. vid.
& Basil. Epist. 41. & Dionysium Alexandrinæ urbis Episcopum,
virum eruditissimum contra Sabellium disputantem, in Arianum
dogma delabi. Hieron. Apol. 2. adv. Ruffin.

** Πολλὰς ἀντιεὑρεῖσας ἔχει φωνὰς τὰς νῦν τοῖς αἰρεπτοῖς ψε-
γίσνου ἵχουν παρεχομένας, ὡς τὸ κτίσμα καὶ τὸ ποίημα, καὶ
εἰποιεῖται. Bas. de Greg. Thaumati. Epist. 64.

†† Κτίσμα ἀντὸν [Χειρὸν] ἀποφαίνεται. Phot. de Theognost.
Cod. 106. Origenis nimium sequax errores immisicuit pessimos;
inter

them Scholars and Followers of the great *Origen*, taught with him, that the Son and Spirit were *Creatures of the Father*.

* *Pierius* another most eminent Scholar of *Origen* taught the same Doctrine. And the Learned *Eusebius of Cæsarea* calls the Son, † “ the perfect “ *Creature of the perfect God.*” And also ; “ the “ substantial Wisdom created [Prov. 8. 22.] of “ God before all Ages.” And declares the Holy Spirit “ to be one of those Beings which were “ made by the Son ; and affirms this to be the “ Doctrine of the holy Catholic Church deliver’d “ in the Scriptures.” And to this agrees the Letter of the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* of the Church of *Alexandria*, which they wrote upon Occasion of the *Arian Controversy* just then broke out, to *Alexander* their Bishop ; in which Letter they tell him ‡ “ that the Faith which they had receiv’d “ from their Forefathers, and had been taught by “ him also, was this. We confess one unbegot- “ ten, only eternal, only true God — that this “ God begat his only-begotten Son before the

inter S. S. Trinitatis personas totidem dignitatis gradus effingens ; Christumque pariter ac Spiritum S. ad creaturarum sortem detru-
dens. *Car. Hist. liter.* p. 98.

* Πεεὶ μέν τοι τῆς πνεύματος ἐπισφαλῶς λίαν καὶ μυστε-
ῖος θυγατρὶς εἰς ὑποβεβηκέντας γὰρ αὐτὸς τῆς τῷ πατέρεσκαι τῇ
ὑἱῷ ἀποφάσκεις δόξης. *De Pierio. Phot Cod.* 119.

† Τέλεον τελεῖ μητρίαθυμα. *Demons. Evang. lib.* 4. c. 2.
Σοφίας χωρῶντος, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀιώνων ὑπὸ τῆς θεᾶς
πιθείσας. *Eclog. Prophet. apud Car. Hist. liter. part.* 2. p. 65.
Τὸ δὲ παρθένιτον πνεῦμα, γῆς θεὸς, γῆς υἱος — ἐν δὲ
η τῶν οἰκανομένων. — ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῆς καθολι-
κῆς καὶ ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας ὡς επὶ οἷς τῶν θείων φωνῶν παρα-
δίδοται τὰ μυστήρια. *De Eccles. Theol. lib.* 3. c. 6. vid. &c cont.
Marcel. lib. 1. c. 4.

‡ Ἡ πίσις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐκ προγόνων, ἦν καὶ ἀπὸ σὺ μεμαθήκαμεν
— μόνον αἰδίου — μόνον αἰλιθίουν. — ὑπεσήσυντα ἴδιῳ θελήματι ἀγ-
γεττον καὶ ἀναλοίωτον κλίσμα τῆς θεᾶς τέλεον. *Apud Atha-
nas. De synod. Arim. & Selenc. & Epiphani. Heres.* 69.

" Ages of the World—that by his own Will
 " he gave him Subsistence, who is the *immutable*
 " and *unchangeable* perfect *Creature of God, &c.*"
 The whole Letter is highly worthy of the Learned Reader's careful Perusal ; and contains the undoubted Catholic Doctrine of the antient Church.

The Inference which I shall draw from the foregoing Sense of Antiquity concerning their Doctrine, that the *Son* and *Spirit* were *created* and *Creatures*, is this ; that as on the one Hand it is absurd, to suppose that the antient Fathers ever thought the *Son* and *Spirit* to be the *supreme God, the same God* with the Father, or *equal* to him in any Respect ; so they, who out of extraordinary Piety, do sometimes magnify our blessed Saviour with great Sublimities of Expression, and never refuse him any Title which the Scripture ascribes to him, wou'd not, in declaring his *Subordination* to God the Father, diminish him by using Expressions in any Degree *lower* than what they thought were warranted by *Scripture*, and necessary to secure the Peerless supreme Majesty and Honour of the ONE GOD and Father of All.

CONCLUSION.

I H A V E laid before the Christian Reader, with the utmost Sincerity and Care, the unanimous Sense of the antient Church, relating to some principal Texts of Scripture on which the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is founded ; and have shewn from thence, that what Dr. Waterland calls and insists to impose as the Doctrine of the Trinity, is not the *Scripture-doctrine*, or that of the *antient Church* at all : but is a merely fictitious Doctrine, directly repugnant to the catholic Doctrine of the *Antenicene* and even *Nicene Church* ; and

and was propagated chiefly after the Council of Nice, in the latter End of the fourth Century (when great Corruptions were crept into the Church) by the superstitious Worshippers of Relicks and Saints ; and supported by Ecclesiastical Tyranny : but it is as really opposite to *Scripture*, *Reason*, and the universal Sense of the primitive Church, as *Darkness* is to *Light* ; and as *Tritheism* is to the fundamental Article of all true Religion, the *Unity* of God.

The *Scripture-doctrine* of the Trinity, on which the right Knowledge of the Christian Economy and Dispensation depends, has been in all Ages from the Beginning corrupted by false and deceitful Teachers ; who in order to depress and diminish the Excellency of the Christian Revelation have taught, either that Christ the Son of God was a mere *Man* (according to the *Jewish* and *Socinian* Notion) or [according to the *Sabellian*—and—*Gnostic* Doctrine] that he was the same *God* with the one *God* and *Father of all* : both by contrary extremes, agreeing in taking away his true and proper Divinity as being the only-begotten Son of God.

The *Doctrine of Tritheism* and *Polytheism* amongst the rest of the old Heresies, dar'd to shew its Head in the first Ages of the Church ; and it was one Branch of the *Gnostic* Impiety, amongst the *Valentinians*, as *Sabellianism* was another ; and also the known *Marcionite* * Doctrine.

The forty first Apostolical Canon points at some who baptiz'd † into three unoriginated Persons. And the ‡ *Apostolical Constitutions* assure us,

* See *Tertul. adv. Marcion. lib. 1.* & *Athanasius de Synod. Arim. & Seleuc. p. 929. edit. Paris. 1627.*

† ΕΙΣ τρεῖς ἀνάρχεις. apud. Coteler. Vol. 1. p. 449.

‡ Οἱ μὲν γὰς πλεῖς ἔνας θεὸς λέγοντι, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἀνάρχεις
οἱ δὲ δύο ἀγενήτες. lib. 6. c. 10.

that some of the *Simonian Gnostic Heretics* taught there were many Gods ; others that there were three unoriginated, and others that there were two unbegotten Persons (or Gods.) And * *Origen* speaks of *Heretics who dar'd to affirm two Gods* : Such were the *Marcionites*.

But as the Heresy of *Ditheism* or *Tritheism* was more wicked and impure than any of the rest, and by immediate Consequence destroy'd not only the Divinity of the *Son*, but the Divinity of the *one God, the Father* also, and was no better than *Atheism* ; so it neither appear'd so openly as the others, and was soon quash'd and came to nothing ; and reviv'd not again till the latter End of the 4th Century, amongst some of the Followers of *Athanasius*.

That Dr. *Waterland's* Doctrine of the Trinity is in the strictest Sense *Tritheism*, I have fully prov'd in the foregoing Papers ; and that he teaches and avows the *Atheistical and diabolical* Doctrine (as the † *Apostolical Constitutions* call it) of *three supreme, necessarily-existent, or unoriginated Persons, Agents or Gods*, in as full and strong Terms as the *Simonian Gnostic Heretics* ever did, has been demonstrated from his many direct Aassertions of this Doctrine ; and particularly, from his affirming it *possible*, that the *Son* might have been *God the Father*, and the *Father* have been the *Son*, and *acted the ministerial Part* : and that the three divine Persons differ in no *essential Perfection* ; but in mere Name or Mode of Existence : for a *Mode of Existence* which is not *essential to the Deity*, or is not an *essential Perfection*, is nothing more than a *mere Name*. And

* Et duos quidem Deos ausos esse haereticos dicere. Lib. 2.
de Princip. c. 7.

† Lib. 6. c. 9, 10.]

Since the Reason and common Sense of all Mankind have ever taught them, that the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of God are *unoriginated* and *underiv'd*; he whose avow'd Doctrine it is, that the *Son* and *Spirit* have the *Nature* and all the *essential Perfections* of the *one God and Father of all*, does, with the *Simonian Heretics*, professedly teach [τρεις ἀνάποδοι & αὐτούντοι] three *unoriginated or necessarily existent, unbegotten Persons, or Gods.*

This is the Doctrine which, with great Bitterness and Uncharitableness of Spirit, Dr. *W.* desires to impose upon the Professors of Christianity; otherwise wou'd exclude them (if he had competent Authority, p. 196.) from the Communion of the Christian Church. If this is not *the Spirit of Antichrist*, 'tis impossible to know what is. He has had sufficient means of Conviction laid before him, from *Scripture, Reason and Antiquity*: But *Scripture* is to be *perverted*, *Reason* is to be *degraded* and *abus'd* by *metaphysical Jargon*, and the Language of all the antient Fathers treated, as if their Words had no meaning at all, or meant the Reverse of what the same Words mean in all other Books whatsoever; and in short, all *Science* and all *Religion, natural and reveal'd*, is to give Way to an unreasonable and Antichristian Hypothesis: and this is the Sum of all Dr. *W.*'s Writings, and the great Busines of his Life. Whoever opposes him must expect nothing but Rage and Rudeness; and tho' he ought long ago to have sat down in Shame and Silence, having been so often and thoroughly confuted; yet being gaul'd and griev'd to see *Truth* prevail and to have many Adherents; and that *Scripture, Reason and Antiquity*, speak all unanimously and loudly for his Adversaries, and as unanimously and loudly condemn him; he is resolv'd [so much is he set against the *Truth*] to try to discourage and quash it by *humane*

humane Authority, and the Force of Church-censures;
 as if he thought there was no sense of Christian
 Liberty in the Governours of the Church ; and
 that Popish Imposition and Tyranny might easily
 be introduc'd. But I hope he will find and feel
 that the more he pleads for humane Authority to
 impose the worst of Errors, the more he will only
kick against the Pricks ; that *Truth* will more and
 more prevail, till at last all *Antichristian Doctrine*
 and *Imposition* being banish'd out of the *Christian*
Church, it will be *without Spot or Wrinkle*, and
 like a pure Virgin fit to be espous'd to *Christ*.

F I N I S.



A Note to be added to P. 7. l. 37.

Dr. Waterland in his *second Defense* (p. 177.) says; " If you ask why that Person call'd the Son, might not have been Father; I have nothing to say, but that in Fact he is not—as to the Son's acting a ministerial Part, that indeed is purely *Oeconomical* [he means, is founded merely upon mutual Concert or Agreement] and there was no Impossibility in the Nature of the Thing, but the Father Himself might have done the same."

This Hypothesis of the Dr's, was charg'd with his supposing it possible, " that unoriginate, might have been originate, and originate, unoriginate; underiv'd, might have been deriv'd, and deriv'd, underiv'd; the Father might have been begotten, and the Son unbegotten." (*Observations on Dr. Waterland's second Defense*, p. 34, 35.) This is the plain unavoidable Consequence of what he allow'd; and it was necessary for the Dr. to say something to abate the Shockingness of it. Wherefore in a Book entitled, *a farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity*, p. 38. he pretends, with regard to the former Part of his Words, viz. *that the Son might have been Father*, seemingly to retract them, saying; *that the Priority of Order (that is the Originateness of the one, and Unoriginateness of the other) is natural, that is necessary, or unalterable, and eternally so.* In which Words he endeavours to evade the Charge above, both by a Contradiction, and really asserting what he had allow'd before. It is an evident Contradiction in the Terms, to say that the *Originateness* of the Son is *necessary*: this is still making originate, to be *unoriginate*; deriv'd, underiv'd; and the Son *unbegotten*. *Necessary Existence* is opposite to *Originated* (and therefore all the Antients constantly teach, that the Son was *originated* or *begotten* by the *Will of the Father*) and is the same as *Unoriginateness*; what is *necessary* (*in se*) in its Existence, cannot be *deriv'd*, or *originated*, or *begotten* from another. And that Dr. W. still means, that the Son is as really *unoriginated* as the Father, is evident, because he makes the *Unoriginateness* of the Father, a mere *Priority of Order*, without any Superiority of *Nature* or *Perfections*; and so a Priority of *Name* only, or the *Order* of placing the Words, *Father, Son, Spirit*; which is a Shameful Quibble. For 'tis his avow'd constant Doctrine, that the Son and Spirit are the *Substance* of the Father; and he disavows all *Difference of Nature, Substance, and Perfections*, amongst them. And to take away all possible and conceivable Distinction between the *Unoriginateness* of the Father, and *Originateness* of the Son; on which is founded the *Supremacy* of the one, and *Ministrations* of the other; he affirms in the latter Part of his Words above cited, that the Father *might have been sent, and have acted the ministerial*

nisterial Part; that being, he says, purely *Economical*, or by voluntary Agreement only; which in Consequence is allowing and affirming, that the Father might have been the Son: for the *Mission* and *ministerial Agency*, in the Sense of Scripture, and of the primitive Church, and in the Reason of Things, are founded in the *Filiation*, or in the natural *Originateness* of the Son by the Will of the Father; and are not compatible (as were always thought *Impiety* and *Blasphemy* to be ascrib'd) to the *Unoriginated Nature* and *supreme Majesty* of God the Father.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 22. l. 18. for preventing read *perverting*. ibid. l. 29. for farther r. *for them*. p. 26. l. 34. del. comma after that. p. 29. l. 20. r. was. p. 33. l. 8. del. and. p. 40. l. 8. for complete r. competent. p. 56. l. 8. dele i. p. 68. l. 5. r. Father only. p. 78. l. 9. r. *of the*. p. 91. l. penult. r. ev. p. 95. l. 3. r. Fau. p. 96. l. ult. r. 3, 4, 6. p. 97. l. ult. r. *καθα*. p. 99. l. 13. r. *by*. p. 122. l. 28. r. c. 15.

by
ng
he
nd
re
he
ay
to
P.

for
of.
om-
ny
ant.
fess